

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS



*Not for mounting
For use in library only*

VOLUME THREE

1958-1959

WESTON COLLEGE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
WESTON 93, MASSACHUSETTS

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS

VOLUME 3

WINTER, 1959

NUMBER 2

Editor-in-Chief

J. J. COLLINS

Associate Editors

The following members of
the Theological Faculty:

E. R. CALLAHAN

B. C. CONNOLLY

P. J. DONNELLY

R. A. DYSON

F. L. MORIARTY

R. G. PHILBIN

J. J. WALSH

Managing Editor

G. W. MACRAE

Business Manager

R. F. PATTERSON

Circulation Manager

P. J. GABRIEL

*Editorial and
Business Assistants*

K. F. DOHERTY

T. J. GIBBONS

M. A. HERNANDEZ

J. A. PAQUET

W. R. PELLETIER

R. N. SPROULE

J. N. TYLEND

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
List of Abstractors	ii

PERIODICAL ABSTRACTS

Inspiration, Interpretation, Texts and Versions, NT General	121
Gospels (General)	130
Synoptic Gospels	136
Gospel of St. John	145
Acts of the Apostles	149
Epistles of St. Paul	150
Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse	164
Biblical Theology	166
Early Church, Gnosticism	185
Dead Sea Scrolls	188

BOOKS AND OPINIONS	193
--------------------------	-----

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	204
--------------------------	-----

BOOK NOTICES	207
--------------------	-----

The contents of abstracts are not necessarily the opinions of the editors of NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS; the views offered on disputed biblical questions remain the opinions of the original authors.

Copyright, ©, 1959, by Weston College
Weston, Mass.

LIST OF ABSTRACTORS

Where no city is mentioned abstractors are from Weston College. Innsbruck (Austria), Los Gatos (Calif.), Louvain (Belgium), Montreal, West Baden (Ind.) and Weston designate theological seminaries of the Society of Jesus in those cities.

Alger (BA) Upholland College, England; *Armbruster* (CJA) West Baden; *Baggarly* (JDB) West Baden; *Bertrand* (RPB); *Bligh* (JFBI) Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome; *Blinzler* (JBz) Prof. NT, Passau, Germany; *Bourke* (MB) Prof. OT, Dunwoodie, N. Y.; *Bresnahan* (JFBr); *Brzoska* (ABB) Los Gatos; *Buckley* (FJB) Los Gatos; *Cachia* (FC) West Baden; *Callahan* (ERC) Prof. Dogmatic Theology; *Cardoni* (AAC); *Clark* (JWC) Los Gatos; *Cobb* (JHC) Prof. Bible and Greek, Yankton College, Yankton, S. Dak.; *Collins* (JJC) Prof. NT and Biblical Greek; *Cornellier* (JGC); *Doherty* (KFD); *Donohue* (JJD); *Ducharme* (JD) Montreal; *Faw* (CEF) Prof. NT, Bethany Biblical Seminary, Chicago; *Foley* (JFF) Innsbruck; *Giblin* (CHG) West Baden; *Graystone*, S.M. (GG) Prof. SS and Moral Theology, Paignton, England; *Greaney* (FPG); *Grispino*, S.M. (JAG) Prof. NT, Marist College, Washington, D. C.; *Johnston* (LJ) Prof. NT, Durham, England; *Kelley* (JTK) West Baden; *Kijauskas* (GKK); *Langevin* (PEL) Montreal; *Laurendeau* (PL) Montreal; *MacRae* (GWM); *Marrow* (SBM); *McGough* (FCM) West Baden; *O'Brien* (JCO'B); *O'Flynn* (JAO'F) Prof. NT, Maynooth, Eire; *O'Rourke* (JO'R) Prof. NT, Overbrook, Philadelphia; *Paré* (AHP); *de la Potterie* (IdIP) Prof. SS, Louvain; *Ramallo* (LIR); *Rawsthorne* (JAR) Upholland College, England; *Richard* (RLR); *Richer* (MR) Montreal; *Robb* (PVR) West Baden; *Ryan* (PJR); *Sant* (CS) Prof. SS, Seminary, Malta; *Saydon*, Msgr. (PPS) Prof. SS, Greek and Hebrew, Royal Univ., Malta; *Smith* (SES); *Sullivan* (DHS); *Sullivan* (FPS).

Note: The contributions of J. Blinzler were translated by staff members. The letter *r* affixed to an entry number designates a book review abstract. References to abstracts in previous issues are given by volume number and entry number: e.g., cf. § 2-222.

PERIODICAL ABSTRACTS

INSPIRATION, INTERPRETATION, TEXTS AND VERSIONS, NT GENERAL

296. J. N. S. ALEXANDER, "The Interpretation of Scripture in the Ante-Nicene Period," *Interpretation* 12 (3, '58) 272-280.

Questions raised at the end of the apostolic age about the relation of the OT to the NT forced the Church to develop a theory of interpretation. Three theories have been stressed at different times, though they usually coexisted. (1) The Authority-development, from about A.D. 450 until the Reformation, had its beginning with early Church Fathers who saw the need for the Church to set up norms for interpretation. (2) The Theoria-development, from the Reformation until today, had its beginning in Antioch as a protest against the allegoric theory. Its exegesis is typological, based on a sense of Scripture deeper than the literal or historical meaning, but firmly based on the letter. (3) Philo the Jew and Christian Gnostics formulated the Allegoria-development, belonging strictly to the ante-Nicene period, before the Alexandrian school adopted it. The important feature of ante-Nicene interpretation was the transcendental quality and foresight of the Church over her opposition.—P. V. R.

297. A. BEA, "L'enciclica 'Pascendi' e gli studi biblici," *Biblica* 39 (2, '58) 121-138.

This article, which reproduces a lecture delivered at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, recalls the eventful days of the early 20th century when Modernism was playing havoc with the teaching of the Catholic Church. In order to ward off further ravages and preserve the Catholic doctrine in all its purity and integrity, Pope St. Pius X published the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis* on September 8, 1907, two months after the condemnation by the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office of 65 propositions containing Modernist errors. In both these documents Holy Scripture holds a conspicuous place. The NT is represented chiefly by the Fourth Gospel, which is considered by the Modernist school as a pious meditation rather than as real history. The most prominent figure of those times was Alfred Loisy whose publications on the NT are well known.—P. P. S.

298. G. C. BERKOUWER, "Revelation: The Christian View," *ChristToday* 3 (1, '58) 15-17; (2, '58) 22-24; (3, '58) 17-18.

In the Hebrew-Christian view of divine revelation we meet the God of history revealing His words and deeds in the OT and the salvation of sinful man in the cross of Christ; this view leads to conclusions about modern Christian life.

299. B. S. CHILDS, "Prophecy and Fulfillment. A Study of Contemporary Hermeneutics," *Interpretation* 12 (3, '58) 259-271.

The writer first reviews thirteen interpretations of the formula "prophecy and fulfillment." Then, examining the biblical concept of fulfillment, he finds that it includes two basic meanings: organic wholeness and completion of words by deeds, which words cause the deeds and share with them one single reality. Moreover, in Hebrew thought the deed was the only criterion of fulfillment. On the other hand, the truth of prophecy was made manifest in the totality formed by the word and its fulfilling event. Thus the Synoptics view Christ's coming as more than the culminating event of the OT, but rather as the fulfillment of the entire Scriptures. It is, then, only logical that the OT be interpreted in terms of the NT. For with the OT the NT shares a single reality. Christ, the fulfillment, actually works in the OT and is not merely prefigured. Further, it is only in view of the NT that we can determine how the prophets' words worked in history and distinguish the prophetic from the merely historical. In the light of such considerations, fulfillment is shown to be a study of God's purpose in history and not simply an outmoded form of exegesis or apologetics.—F. C. M.

300. C. H. GIBLIN, "'As It Is Written . . . ' A Basic Problem in Noematics (II)," *CathBibQuart* 20 (4, '58) 477-498.

[Cf. § 3-4.] The theme of Romans is stated at the beginning of the Epistle (1:1): the Gospel announced in advance with a view to its realization in Christ *Kyrios*. The fulfillment of the *proepaggelion* in the *euaggelion* is revolutionary: man cannot judge the "justice" of God. Moving back through the OT (Prophets, Psalms, Law, Abraham, Adam; Rom 1-5), Paul views salvation-history as fulfilled analogously in Christ. At every stage of Rom 1-5 Paul presents an OT-NT interrelation between already inner-related series of events. The sense of Scripture which interests Paul is its "theological meaning," not what is today termed its "literal sense." The "analogous fulfillment" in question is clarified by a discussion of Hebrew thought patterns and of the technique called "typology."

The latter may be employed either in homiletic or in biblical theology. In itself, then, typology is just a concrete mode of expressing a relationship. What underlies this literary form of expression in Rom 1-5, especially in Rom 5, is the metahistorical analogy of fulfillment apropos of a life principle. It is unnecessary, then, to posit a special "typological sense."—C. H. G. (Author).

301. L. JOHNSTON, "Pius XII and Sacred Scripture. 'Divino Afflante Spiritu,'" *Tablet* 212 (6178, Oct. 18, '58) 329-330.

A summary of the encyclical on Scripture published in 1943. "In it the Pope does nothing less than sanction a revolution" by his open, progressive attitude.

302. A. JONES, "Biblical Inspiration: A Christian Rendezvous?" *Scripture* 10 (12, '58) 97-109.

In recent years there has been a growth in understanding between Catholic and Protestant scholars. On the one side there has been a retreat from the fundamentalist interpretation of orthodox Protestantism; on the other side there has been a recovery from undue preoccupation with inerrancy. The intellectual approach to the Bible which the Protestant scholar used in the defense he made against Illuminism and Liberalism is now being rejected, and the Protestant of today has reacted by demanding that the Bible be left what it is—a personal impact of God. For the authority of the Bible Barth is now seeking a more objective (but still intrinsic) norm. The Catholic scholar cannot suppress the part of the intellect as Barth does, and Bultmann to a far greater degree, but he should not overemphasize it. J suggests that in order to remove several of the difficulties which separate Catholic and Protestant views, the Catholic scholar can easily help by being more careful with the terminology he uses. Moreover, the Catholic biblical revival must not be allowed to exhaust itself in historical inquiry, but should concentrate more on the Bible as theology, especially as being the story of God's way with man, and thereby the quasi-sacramental tool of God.—B. A.

303. G. W. H. LAMPE, "Authority in Bible, Church and Reason," *LondQuart HolRev* 27 (4, '58) 252-256.

The problem of authority is the most important point of division among Christians today. For those who accept no infallibility, authority resides in experience, that of eyewitnesses, of the Church, of the present-day believer. For the "Fundamentalists," the authority of Scripture or of Councils and Pope is infallible. Of the sources of authority—Bible, tradition and reason—reason is prior, but reason in this case denotes experience, not demonstration. Religious experience is the acceptance of Christian life in the light of certain basic, unprovable assumptions about God and man. In practice the authority of experience leads to acceptance of the authority of the Church, for the individual believer tests the authority of what is presented to him as Christianity on the basis of his personal religious experience. The experience of the apostolic age is wholly unique: it is not separate from the revelation of God and as such it is the basis for the authority of the NT. The Bible is rightly considered part of the Church's tradition; the Church must interpret it, but it remains the ultimate appeal for the Church's corporate misunderstandings.—G. W. M.

304. S. McCORMICK, "The Bible As Record and Medium," *Interpretation* 12 (3, '58) 292-308.

What is the Bible? How is it to be interpreted? This article presents the answer of contemporary biblical scholarship. The Bible is a record of what God said and did in the past, and a medium through which He confronts men

now. What God has said and now says is unified by the common purpose of redemption. Examining the Bible as record one asks: is this historical? Examining it as medium one asks: what does the Bible tell us about history? History is defined as the sphere in which God acts as He reveals the redemptive process.

Interpretation of the Bible rests on two necessities. The necessity of theological presuppositions means the viewpoint must be that of the Resurrection. A non-theological interpretation of a theocentric book is impossible. Another necessity is that of personal response to the Bible's demand that it be read with the same faith with which it was written. To determine the meaning of the Bible for today's world each interpreter ultimately must rely upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit.—C. J. A.

305. J. L. McKENZIE, "Problems in Hermeneutics in Roman Catholic Exegesis," *JournBibLit* 77 (3, '58) 197-204.

It is to *Divino Afflante Spiritu* that Catholic exegesis owes its recent impetus. But as the encyclical encouraged scientific biblical studies, so did it reflect the continuing and progressive work of scholars in the Church from the time of M. J. Lagrange.

The exegete, Catholic or Protestant, must first try to determine the literal sense of the Bible by scientific application of historical, literary and cultural studies. Especially in the OT, basic to biblical theology, is increased Catholic effort in this direction required. Such study of biblical sense and biblical theology can ideally be independent of sectarian conviction and prejudice, and will help at least toward mutual personal understanding between members of the different Churches. It is the scholars' task to present the matter. The Church interprets its meaning. But the Catholic scholar has the added burden of presenting the matter both popularly and for the systematic theologian. The latter must then understand and accept it and re-evaluate his own use of Scripture. Who, moreover, but the biblical scholar can insure that the Catholic demand for biblical theology will eventuate in accurate and meaningful results? This study of biblical theology involves as a main problem investigation of the unity of the NT and the OT. Thus again have been brought to the fore the questions of typology, traditional in Catholic exegesis, spiritual interpretation, and the fuller sense of Scripture, which is still widely favored despite its many unanswered difficulties. Rabbinical exegesis and that of the Qumran documents should prove more helpful in studying the use of the OT in the NT.—F. C. M.

306. R. E. McNALLY, "The 'Tres Linguae Sacrae' in early Irish Bible Exegesis," *TheolStud* 19 (3, '58) 395-403.

Following the example of Hilary of Poitiers, Augustine and Isidore of Seville, Irish biblical scholars of the early medieval period considered Hebrew, Greek and Latin as *tres linguae sacrae*, and made repeated recourse to them in the

interpretation of Scripture. The attempts at exegesis are, however, restricted to single words and phrases and no attempt is made to use philology to comment on a whole thought pattern or to solve a historical problem. Moreover, the Hebrew and Greek words which form the basis of the exegesis are often mere excerpts from patristic sources or inventions of fantasy, evidencing a lack of linguistic proficiency which helps to explain the low estate of exegesis from the 7th to the 9th centuries when the Irish dominated.—P. J. R.

307. J. I. PACKER, "Contemporary Views of Revelation," *ChristToday* 3 (4, '58) 3-6; (5, '58) 15-17.

Modern views of revelation are attempting to restore essential biblical dimensions to the older liberal position by concentrating on revelation through historical events and personal encounter with the speaking God, and these attempts lead to illuminism or mysticism. The possibility of right and true thinking about God can be guaranteed only by submission to the Bible as an infallible written revelation from God.—G. W. M.

308. P. P. SAYDON, "St. Thomas Aquinas' Biblical Commentaries," *MelTheol* 10 (2, '58) 37-46.

S lists the commentaries and notes that the academic methods of Paris and Naples must shape our understanding of that exegesis. Significantly, Thomas' inaugural address in 1252 puts both the proto- and the deuterocanonical books in the canon. His *Catena Aurea* was probably preceded by another, now-lost commentary on the four Gospels. Thomas regarded all the Pauline Epistles as logically unified by the theme: Christ's grace. The chronology and sources of his commentaries are unsolved problems.—D. H. S.

Texts and Versions

309. G. A. BARROIS, "Reflections on Two French Bibles," *TheolToday* 15 (2, '58) 211-216.

Two Bibles, the so-called *Bible de Jérusalem* and the *Bible de la Pléiade*, appeared in 1956 to add to a growing number of good modern Bibles in French. Both of them are characterized by elaborate critical, historical and literary introductions and substantial, compact notes dealing with crucial cultural and religious matters.

The *Bible de Jérusalem*, so named because it originated as a project of the *École Biblique et Archéologique Française* in Jerusalem, is the work of more than thirty editors and translators, most of them disciples of the late Father Lagrange, founder of the school. It contains the whole Bible and, while its stress is "resolutely doctrinal," in its introductions and notes it is remarkably free from narrow dogmatism and from any evidence of the various brands of theology professed by the religious orders represented among its contributors. It demonstrates a similar freedom and catholicity in the handling of critical

problems of sources, authorship and historical origins. Its most serious weakness is a certain lack of unity due to its diverse literary personality.

The name *Bible de la Pléiade* is reminiscent of a group of seven poets of the French Renaissance known as *La Pléiade* and of the symbolic title of a collection of French classics by that name. It contains the OT only, in two volumes, of which only the first has been published. The editor and almost one-man contributor is E. Dhorme, himself a former professor and director of the *École Biblique*. The emphasis is upon cultural and religious values rather than strictly theological concerns, and yet the work demonstrates "an extraordinary gift of psychological intuition and of sympathy," a "fingertip-feeling for the language of the Bible," and "a way of probing deep and of attaining to the very substance of Biblical thought."—C. E. F.

310. E. A. N[IDA], "Some Contemporary Translations in French," *BibTrans* 9 (4, '58) 151.

F. MICHAELI, "The Bible of 'La Pleiade' by Ed. Dhorme," 152-153.

H. CAZELLES, "The Jerusalem Bible," 153-155.

"Extracts from the Review of the Jerusalem Bible of the Periodical *Bible et Vie Chrétienne*, December 1956," 155-157.

J. DE SAVIGNAC, "Observations on the Version of the Bible Called 'The Jerusalem Bible,'" 158-161.

311. J. N. BIRDSALL, "The Text of the Acts and the Epistles in Photius," *JournTheolStud* 9 (2, '58) 278-291.

An examination of the readings from Acts and the Epistles in Photius shows that the text he used was not the Byzantine, but texts like those classified in the I-groups of von Soden. These are either direct descendants of 3rd- or 4th-century texts or the result of mixing Byzantine and earlier texts in the medieval period. The fact that Photius conserves so many ancient and good readings "may at least suggest that the present emphasis in some spheres of research upon the investigation into the Byzantine text and the lectionaries may not be without value for the establishment of the original text and for the tracing of earlier epochs of textual development."—G. W. M.

312. J. DUPLACY, "Où en est la Critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament? III (fin)," *RechSciRel* 46 (3, '58) 431-462.

[Cf. §§ 2-236; 3-24.] This final installment is concerned with the history of the versions, general conclusions on the history of the text, and the history of the printed text.

313. K. GABRIS, "Codex Maurocordatianus (I)," *CommViat* 1 (1, '58) 33-36; plates I-IV.

Codex Maurocordatianus is an early 10th-century Byzantine minuscule MS of the four Gospels, in the library of the Evangelical Lyceum in Pressburg; its history and appearance are described here.

314. J. H. GREENLEE, "A Misinterpreted *Nomen Sacrum* in P⁹," *HarvTheol Rev* 51 (3, '58) 187.

Grenfell and Hunt have misread an abbreviation in P⁹. They read *chths* (1 Jn 4:16) and in a note observe that the scribe mixed up the abbreviations for Christ and God. An examination of a photograph of the papyrus indicates that the abbreviation is the not unusual one for Christ, *chrs.*—J. J. C.

315. R. E. W. MADDISON, "Robert Boyle and the Irish Bible," *BullJohnRyl Lib* 41 (1, '58) 81-101.

A history of translations of the Bible in the Irish language in the 17th century.

316. G. MALDFELD, "Zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes," *TheolZeit* 14 (1, '58) 47-52.

A summary and critical review of J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes* 1 (1955); 2 (1956); 3 (1955).

NT General

317. J. BAUER, "*Pōs* in der griechischen Bibel," *NovTest* 2 (2, '57) 81-91.

An examination of NT and LXX texts using *pōs* in questions reflects the influence of Hebrew idiom. With the present or aorist tense of the verb, the construction is used to indicate that something is unlawful or irrational; with the future, it is used to reject something as unthinkable. In classical Greek the latter is a deliberative question; in biblical Greek it is a rhetorical question implying a negation. This understanding of the construction has direct bearing on the readings or interpretation of such passages as Lam 4:1; Ruth 3:18; Jn 14:5; Rom 10:14 f.; 1 Jn 3:17.—G. W. M.

318. H. J. CADBURY, "Some Foibles of New Testament Scholarship," *Journ BibRel* 26 (3, '58) 213-216.

Scholars should avoid theologically biased translations, repetition of mere hypotheses, the assumption of a chronological pattern in the Synoptic Gospels, assertion of medical interest in Luke, naming of anonymous persons, uncritical support of current scholarly fads, and the incautious repeating of the jargon of pedants, such as the incorrect use of *gnosis* and *kerygma*.—J. H. C.

319. C. DAVIS, "The Living Word," *Worship* 32 (9, '58) 518-531.

The Bible is part of the living tradition of the word of God in the Church, reflected clearly in the Church's liturgy.

320. E. FASCHER, "Eine Neuordnung der neutestamentlichen Fachdisziplin? Bemerkungen zum Werk von M. Albertz: Die Botschaft des Neuen Testaments," *TheolLitZeit* 83 (9, '58) 609-618.

Albertz attempts a complete break with post-Enlightenment methods

(*Betrachtungsweise*) and divisions of NT introduction and theology. The introduction is to be replaced by the "origin of the message," in which, however, the history not only of the canon but also of the text is inadequately treated. On the other hand, in this section of his work A treats many questions which earlier divisions would have related to the history of primitive Christianity, the history of NT times, or early Church history. In place of a NT theology, A would establish a "development of the message." But the critical reader must wonder at the untroubled ease with which A ties together OT and NT passages and uncritically uses them as arguments for certain definite trains of thought. Nevertheless his work contains a wealth of suggestions for further research.
—J. Bz.

321. F. W. GINGRICH, "The Most Interesting Words in the World," *Bib Trans* 9 (4, '58) 161-163.

A brief discussion of problems of lexicography and translation of a number of NT words.

322. V. R. GOLD, "The Mosaic Map of Madeba," *BibArch* 21 (3, '58) 50-71.

A study of the Madeba map with special reference to the recent work of R. T. O'Callaghan and M. Avi-Yonah. Of the individual sites the following NT places are treated in detail: Aenon and Bethabara, Jericho, Sychar and Shechem, Bethlehem and Jerusalem.

323. W. R. HUTTON, "Considerations for the Translation of Greek *en*," *Bib Trans* 9 (4, '58) 163-170.

It is not always recognized that *en* has so many meanings that a strictly systematic treatment is impossible. The so-called original meaning "in" should often yield to *en pregnans*, "to," as in Rom 9:17, despite all contrary versions. The dative of advantage (Col 1:27) or disadvantage (Jas 5:5), "for," adds new dimensions; moreover, *en* is often synonymous with *eis*, "into" (Rev 1:10) or "unto" (1 Pt 1:2). The numerous other *en* texts analyzed indicate that the "justification of a given translation must often be found in the immediate context, but sometimes it must be sought in the manner in which a concept is expressed in all the places where it occurs."—K. F. D.

324. A. JONES, "The Bible: News of God," *Scripture* 10 (9, '58) 17-21.

A brief survey of the Bible as "a commented diary of God's activity among men," moving from the historical event becoming a word in the OT through the Word becoming an historical event in the NT.

325. H. J. RICHARDS, "The Word of God Incarnate," *Scripture* 10 (10, '58) 44-48; reprinted in *LifeSpir* 13 (146-147, '58) 93-98.

To avoid the extremes of "Biblical Arianism," which regards the Bible as an exclusively human book, and "Biblical Docetism," which considers it exclusively

divine, the modern reader must have some understanding of the use of literary forms in the Bible.

326. L. STEFANIAK, "De Novo Testamento ut Christianismi basi historica," *DivThom* 61 (2-3, '58) 113-130.

Notwithstanding the contrary arguments brought forward by rationalists and materialists, it can confidently be stated that the NT documents offer a sure historical basis for Christianity. The results of the archaeological excavations carried out in Asia Minor demonstrate the historical value of the books written by those who were eyewitnesses of the word (Lk 24:19) and hence of the Church of Christ. The arguments adduced to prove these statements are mostly the traditional ones found in any manual of biblical introduction.—C. S.

327. W. F. STINESPRING, "History and Present Status of Aramaic Studies," *JournBibRel* 26 (4, '58) 298-303.

The history of the Aramaeans is unremarkable; the history of their language is spectacular. Fourteen hundred years after the people had ceased to be a political power, the language remained influential. Old Aramaic is represented in the North Syrian inscriptions of the 10th to the 7th centuries B.C. In the next stage Aramaic was the lingua franca of the Assyrian Empire. Aramaic endorsements continue into Hellenistic times. Under the non-Semitic Persians Aramaic attained its widest use. It became the everyday language of Israel and so remained through Hellenistic and Roman times. Nabataean was a sister dialect to Jewish Aramaic. Aramaic was the language of Palmyra from 33 B.C. to A.D. 274. The great Aramaic period in Judaism was the period of the Amoraim, the compilers of the Talmuds. The Targums also were Aramaic. Part of the Kabbalistic Zohar was in Aramaic. The Mandaean sect, Gnostic and Mesopotamian, used this language.—J. H. C.

328. M. SMITH, "Aramaic Studies and the Study of the New Testament," *JournBibRel* 26 (4, '58) 304-313.

Relevant to NT studies are the Nabataean and Palmyrene inscriptions, the translations of both Testaments into Syriac, and the Palestinian Aramaic found in inscriptions, in Aramaic literature prior to A.D. 70, in Samaritan literature and in rabbinic writings. Daniel, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Genesis Apocryphon and certain Qumran scrolls are the major fragments before 70. The rabbis and the Samaritans especially used Aramaic, and Christians have neglected the Samaritan material. In Jesus' Palestine Aramaic was spoken alongside Hebrew and dominant Greek.—J. H. C.

329. A. VACCARI, "Cristo, il Cristo, il Messia," *RivistBib* 6 (2, '58) 97-101.

In some modern translations the noun "Christ" is used with the article. In Greek the article accompanies proper names; in Italian proper names do not take an article. The Latins understood *Christus* as a proper name. In

Italian the article with *Cristo* signifies: *a*) the image (in art) of Christ; *b*) a particular theological or philosophical concept of Christ; *c*) the abstract concept of the dignity of the consecrated person or the person in general adorned with this dignity (Mt 2:4; 22:42; Mk 14:61). The origin of the abstract concept is the Hebrew term *mashiah* or the Aramaic *meshiha* (36 times in the MT) and *Christos* in the LXX. The Latin use of the term *Christus* passed into modern languages. In the 16th century "Messiah" came into use in all languages. Whenever, therefore, the term *ho Christos* in the NT denotes the dignity itself, "Messiah" should be used; otherwise "Christ" without the article. This practice is already accepted by many modern translators.—C. S.

330. J. J. COLLINS AND G. W. MACRAE, "Report of the Twenty-first General Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America," *CathBibQuart* 20 (4, '58) 499-506.

Brief summaries of the papers and discussions at the meeting in September, 1958.

331. J. HARVEY, "Le Congrès biblique international catholique, Louvain, 25-30 août 1958," *SciEccl* 10 (3, '58) 521-525.

A critical report and summary of some of the papers at the Louvain-Brussels congress.

332. M. ZERWICK, "RR. Patrum Franciscanorum Italiae primus de re biblica conventus," *VerbDom* 36 (4, '58) 225-231.

Summary of the papers read at the Franciscan biblical congress at Rome, September, 1957. [Cf. § 3-47.]

GOSPELS (GENERAL)

333. J. B. BAUER, "Drei Tage," *Biblica* 39 (3, '58) 354-358.

References to a three-day period occur in the Old and the New Testaments. In these expressions the number three has no mathematical value, but denotes only an indefinite, short period, hence "a few." Thus Christ's rising from the dead on the third day (Mk 8:31; 10:34; Mt 16:21; 17:23; 20:19; Lk 9:22; 18:33; 24:7; Acts 10:40; 1 Cor 15:4) means that Christ will rise up a short time after His death. In the same sense must be taken Christ's words about the reconstruction of the Temple (Mk 14:58; 15:29; Mt 26:61; 27:40; Jn 2:19 f.) and Jonah's sign (Mt 12:40). See also Jn 2:1; Acts 25:1; 28:17.—P. P. S.

334. J. BLINZLER, "Zum Problem der Brüder des Herrn. II Teil," *Trier TheolZeit* 67 (4, '58) 224-246.

[Cf. § 3-49.] The brethren of Jesus were cousins, and we have the following information about their parentage. The name of Simon and Jude's mother is unknown, but their father was Cleopas, a brother of St. Joseph. The brethren

James and Joses (Joseph) were sons of a certain Mary whose husband was probably a priest or Levite and possibly a brother of St. Joseph or of the Virgin Mary. After the death of St. Joseph the mother of Jesus would have gone to live with her nearest relative, and the sons in that family—because Aramaic lacked a brief term for cousins—would be called the “brethren of Jesus.” This title the early Church took over to designate the near relatives of Jesus who became prominent in the Christian community.

How then did it happen that patristic writers so long interpreted the term otherwise? The answer can be found in the changes in the Church and the memory of men. When the NT books were written, Christians would not misunderstand the term, and in the 2nd century Hegesippus indicates that he realizes the brethren are actually cousins. With the passage of time and the spread of the Church into more new lands this knowledge became dim, and Christians reading the NT were puzzled by the term “brethren.” About A.D. 200 we find the interpretation that these were whole brothers of Jesus, although even from the middle of the 2nd century many writers, including Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Epiphanius and Ephraem, considered that the brethren were stepbrothers and children of Joseph by a previous marriage, basing their interpretation not on any tradition but on the conviction of the perpetual virginity of Mary. Towards the end of the 4th century when Helvidius claimed that the brothers were whole brothers of Jesus, arguing from an exegesis which was certainly false, Jerome easily refuted this thesis and the thesis of stepbrothers and on purely exegetical grounds proved that the brethren were cousins of Jesus.—J. J. C.

335. B. C. BUTLER, “St. Peter: History and Theology,” *ClerRev* 43 (8, '58) 449-461; (9, '58) 513-530.

O. Cullmann's book on Peter is divided into historical and theological sections. The division is not altogether valid, but his historical reconstruction grants that Peter was given the primacy (though in such circumstances as to suggest that it was only temporary; Jn 21 speaks of it in connection with his death, but comparison with Jn 10 shows that the ideas of shepherd and death are connected, and if the Good Shepherd can hand on His function, why not the vicar-shepherd?). C grants also that Peter went to Rome but holds that he then relinquished the government to James. But all the evidence concerning James is satisfactorily accounted for by remembering the very live danger of Judaizing, which James typifies, and Peter's responsibility to preserve unity. This further reminds us that Peter's move from Jerusalem had providential consequences: had he stayed he might have become the prisoner of the Judaizing wing of the early Church.

In his exegesis of Mt 16:17-19 C accepts the authenticity and historicity of the passage (he suggests that the original context was connected with Lk 22:31-32, but the passage is essential to the elaborate literary structure of Matthew). The Church is the Messianic community essential to the Messianic

idea. Mt 7:24 ff. shows that the rock is that which makes the building impregnable against the attacks of evil, and the keys therefore indicate admission into the community of the supernaturally living.

Peter is rock because of his office and his office is that of apostle, unique as an eyewitness (says C). But the office of apostle is unique only accidentally, by reason of relationship to Christ, the revelation, not unique in what the apostles held, taught or did. Their function of eyewitnesses concerns non-Christians; within the Church they preached, judged and governed. All these functions can be handed on. To say that Peter's primacy was primacy as an eyewitness (first to see the risen Lord) and that it is preserved in the primacy of teaching through Mark's Gospel, the first to be written, is to provide a small and precarious rock as foundation for the Church.

Peter's office of strengthening and feeding the Church is one which can be handed on. Moreover, it must be, if the social structure which makes a society is to be preserved. If we appeal to the guidance of the Spirit, what in fact did the Spirit lead the community to do? To accept the primacy of Peter's successors.—L. J.

336. J. A. EMERTON, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," *JournTheol Stud* 9 (2, '58) 225-242.

E limits his study to Dan 7, 1 Enoch 37-71, 2 Esdras 13 and Sibylline Oracles 5:414-433. The Son of Man imagery was originally connected with an enthronement festival, under the influence of Canaanite mythology. Apart from later interpretations or beliefs, the two figures of the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man correspond to two original deities; it is probable that eventually Yahweh was identified with both gods, and the Son of Man then came to be regarded as a lesser being.—G. W. M.

337. P. HOSSFELD, "Der Koran und die vier Evangelien. Überlegungen beim Vergleich heiliger Texte der grossen Weltreligionen," *TheolGlaub* 48 (5, '58) 353-365.

A comparison of the images of God and man depicted in the Koran with those in the four Gospels; many of the nobler qualities found in the former show borrowings from the Bible.

338. J. JEREMIAS, "The Present Position in the Controversy Concerning the Problem of the Historical Jesus," *ExpTimes* 69 (11, '58) 333-339.

To understand Bultmann's position, it is necessary to retrace its genesis. Reimarus in 1778 first pointed out the fact that the Jesus of history and the Christ preached by the Church were not the same. With history severed from dogmatics, the Enlightenment sought a return to the historical Jesus of Nazareth. Rationalists, idealists, social thinkers and others attempted psychological reconstructions that were ultimately products of wish-fulfillment. Schweitzer himself, long the vigorous opponent of these unscientific representa-

tions, eventually fell into the same trap in describing the motive of Jesus' Passion. With Kähler (1892), theology turned to the attack: not the historical Jesus of these reconstructed lives, but solely the biblical Christ proclaimed by the apostles, is of permanent significance for faith. Today, under the influence of Bultmann, critical theology has "withdrawn into the inviolable fortress of the Kerygma," and has finally abandoned as futile her search for the historical Jesus. "We cannot write a life of Jesus because the sources are lacking, and what we can regard as historical is a Jewish prophet and His message."

Yet, though we cannot write His life, sound criticism forces us to go back to Jesus and His message. The sources put the origin of Christianity, not in the kerygma, but in the appearance of the man Jesus of Nazareth. The kerygma, inasmuch as it proclaims an historical event, "refers us back from itself at every turn." The problem of the historical Jesus must be taken seriously. Moreover, critical research has set up adequate "ramparts" to preserve us from the unscientific reconstructions of the past: (1) sensitivity to "strands of tradition," (2) removal of the "Hellenistic layer," (3) insight into Jesus' opposition to the religiosity of His time, (4) the significance of His Aramaic mother-tongue, and (5) realization that "the whole message of Jesus flowed from His awareness that God was about to break into history." Occupation with the historical Jesus is the central task of NT scholarship. The gospel of Jesus and the kerygma cannot be separated; but neither can they be placed on the same level. They are related as call and response; "Jesus of Nazareth is God's call, the confession of Him is the response." The decisive thing is not the response, but the call, which is the sole presupposition of the kerygma, and which alone is revelation.—R. L. R.

339. J. J. KAVANAGH, "The Date of the Last Supper," *Philippine Studies* 6 (1, '58) 105-114.

Cf. §§ 2-15, 26, 261, 514, 517; 3-50.

340. R. LECONTE, "Bethléem aux jours du roi Hérode," *BibTerreSainte* 15 ('58) 4-9.

A brief account of the reign of Herod the Great, of the city of Bethlehem and of its basilica. Ten photographs accompany the text.

341. V. MARCOZZI, "Osservazioni medico-psicologiche sui fatti concernenti la risurrezione di N.S.," *Gregorianum* 39 (2, '58) 440-462.

That Jesus actually died is clear from the evidence, and no valid objection can be raised from the coming forth of blood and water from His side after His death, because medical studies have discovered parallel cases. The actual cause of the death seems to have been either suffocation or failure of the circulation of the blood, a conclusion from observations of the physical condition of volunteers who for a short time endured a rigid posture similar to that of the cross and from the observation of an actual crucifixion at Dachau. Finally,

only the actual Resurrection of Jesus can explain the mental attitude of His followers on and after Easter.—J. J. C.

342. K. PRÜMM, "I cosiddetti 'dei morti e risorti' nel 'ellenismo,'" *Gregorianum* 39 (2, '58) 411-439.

The term "gods who died and rose again" was unknown in antiquity—Tertullian implies that even the concept of a risen god was unknown to pagans—and the very use of the phrase might suggest that a similarity exists here between the cults and Christianity. After this warning the author examines various suggested parallels and draws his conclusions. One can admit that there is a similarity between Christianity and fertility cults and allied mysteries inasmuch as all is centered about the death and survival of a mortal hero as well as of the initiates. But in these cults there is no real communion of death and life between the initiate and the god, no communion which would inform the entire life of man and give him a future life. Furthermore, the heroes of the myths die because they are mortal, while Christ, who is immortal, chooses to die and He can therefore give victory over death. It is therefore the Incarnation which essentially distinguishes Christianity from other religions, and, unlike the mysteries, which tended to divinize the mother of the hero, the distinction in nature and honor between Jesus and His mother was clearly preserved.—J. J. C.

343. J. M. ROBINSON, "The Quest of the Historical Jesus Today," *TheolToday* 15 (2, '58) 183-197.

The end of the quest of the historical Jesus came with the work of Schweitzer and the rise of the kerygma to the center of NT scholarship, with Bultmann giving classical expression of this end. It is among Bultmann's most outstanding pupils, Käsemann, Fuchs and Bornkamm, that a concern for reopening the quest is apparent. The possibility of such a quest is now due to a radically different understanding of history. Nineteenth-century historiography sought to establish causal relationships and to classify the particular in terms of the general, stressing nature and man and largely by-passing transcendence. In the 20th century "history is the act of intention, the commitment, the meaning for the participants, behind the external occurrence, and in such intention and commitment the self of the participant actualizes itself and is revealed."

Recent NT study focuses attention upon the "kerygma as the New Testament statement of Jesus' history and selfhood." Jesus' personal "history and selfhood" are accessible to the new historiography and biography and there are ample materials in the Gospels, not of *ipsissima verba* and *bruta facta*, but of kerygmatic meanings to make a "history" or "life" of Jesus possible.

The remaining question is one of the necessity of such a quest. This "ought" lies in the fact that (1) the NT kerygma is not proclaiming mythological ideas but the "existent meaningfulness of a historical person"; (2) what the kerygma says of the reality of Jesus cannot be different from the message, intention, self, "person" of the historical Jesus. If faith is separated from every psychic oc-

currence, if it is beyond consciousness, it is no longer real. "Bultmann's procedure of eliminating Jesus' message from primitive Christianity means ultimately that 'Christian faith is understood as faith in the exalted Lord for whom the historical Jesus as such no longer possesses constitutive significance' (Käsemann)."

R concludes: "Given our existential situation as scholars in a world where a historical encounter with Jesus is possible, to neglect such an encounter would be a tacit admission either that Jesus is not the Lord, or that God cannot be encountered in history. Since either alternative would be a denial of the kerygma, we have, theologically speaking, no other alternative than to concern ourselves with the quest of the historical Jesus."—C. E. F.

344. J. T. Ross, "Source Analysis for the Study of the Life of Christ," *Journ BibRel* 26 (4, '58) 314-317.

The search for the real Jesus has produced two schools, one asserting that the historical Jesus cannot be recovered at all and the other certain that a character-portrait can be obtained. This source-analysis assumes the correctness of the two-document hypothesis, the more assured results of *Formgeschichte* and the presence of some historic traditions in the Fourth Gospel. Fourteen items are common to all of the four Gospels. These are concentrated in the Passion-Resurrection sequence. Forty items are common to three Synoptics, eleven to Matthew and Mark, two to Mark and Luke, and six to Matthew and Luke. For the purposes of study one may underscore in red those that belong to all four of the Gospels, in blue the items in Matthew-Mark-John, and in black the items in Matthew-Luke-John.—J. H. C.

345. I. L. SANDERS, "The Origin and Significance of the Title 'The Son of Man' as Used in the Gospels," *Scripture* 10 (10, '58) 49-56.

The Gospels' use of the title "the Son of Man" is most probably derived from the Parables of Enoch (now generally admitted to have been written in the first century B.C.), which in turn seems to depend in this respect on Dan 7:13-14. In Enoch the Son of Man is a Messianic figure who is more than man, yet distinct from the angels. Christ preferred this Messianic title to all others, apparently because it was a "neutral" title, i.e., one which, though known to the Jews, had the fewest materialistic and political overtones and from which Christ could best lead men to a realization of His divinity.—G. W. M.

346. M. F. WILES, "Early Exegesis of the Parables," *ScotJournTheol* 11 (3, '58) 287-301.

A study of the interpretation of parables in the ante-Nicene Fathers shows how the parables were understood by those nearest to them in point of history, and corroborates the inferences of J. Jeremias that the work of interpretation by the Church had already affected the parables in the period before the writing of the Gospels.

Five of the canons of interpretation laid down by these Fathers are worthy of note: (1) the likenesses in parables are not intended to be complete in every detail; (2) established doctrine is a guide for right interpretation of parables, not a derivative from them; (3) the historical context of the parables in the Gospels should be noted; (4) we should expect to find some meaning deeper than the surface meaning of the parables; (5) a true understanding of the parables cannot be attained except by the help of Christ and the gift of the Spirit of God.

These early Christian writers, however, did not always obey their own maxims. In their exegesis of the parables these five tendencies emerge: (1) the fatal tendency towards allegorical interpretation, this under the influences of the Evangelists themselves, the tradition of the elders, the Gnostic interpretations and the urge to find a deeper meaning; (2) the tendency to generalize the significance of the parables; (3) the tendency to group parables together and to interpret them in the light of one another; (4) the strong tendency to think of the kingdom of God as likened to the main item in the parable rather than to the situation as a whole; (5) the tendency to use the parables as scriptural arguments in support of the writer's own particular understanding of a Christian duty or truth. These five implicit tendencies are along lines similar to those which Jeremias attributes, by inference, to ecclesiastical interpretation in the pre-literary period of the Church. They indicate that J's analysis is likely to be along the right lines.—J. J. D.

SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

347. I. BUSE, "The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John," *ExpTimes* 70 (1, '58) 22-24.

The problem of the Johannine and Synoptic accounts of the Cleansing of the Temple is twofold: *a*) the date of the occurrence differs notably, and *b*) the content of the narratives differs in details. The many divergences and then the striking agreements between John and Mark have caused authors to disagree on whether John knew Mark's narrative or not. W. E. Bundy, through his explanation of *tauta* in Mk 11:27 as referring to the Cleansing (vv. 18-27a being secondary), offers a conclusion which seems to indicate that John knew Mark's sources better than Mark's narrative. The fact that there are agreements of Matthew and Luke with John against Mark seems to support the explanation that the four Evangelists were all dependent upon an account of the Temple Cleansing earlier than the Markan story.—R. P. B.

348. A. FEUILLET, "Les perspectives propres à chaque évangéliste dans les récits de la transfiguration," *Biblica* 39 (3, '58) 281-301.

Although the written composition of the Gospels was preceded by a relatively long period of oral transmission, it is wrong to consider the Evangelists, as form-critics do, as mere compilers of pre-existent literary units. Each Evangelist has his own doctrinal standpoint, and it is in the light of this standpoint

that the whole Gospel must be viewed. The writer chooses for examination the narrative of the Transfiguration. In Mark the Transfiguration is a manifestation of Christ's glory which will follow His Passion, the glorification of the risen Lord. This is borne out by St. Peter, Mark's chief informant, who considers the Transfiguration as a manifestation of Christ's divine majesty and a pledge of His Second Coming (2 Pt 1:16-18). Luke places the Transfiguration in close relationship with Christ's Ascension. Moses and Elijah were talking with Christ about His impending "departure," *exodos*, a word which is taken to mean the whole period from the Passion to the Ascension, a period corresponding to that of the Israelites' wanderings in the wilderness before they entered the Promised Land. And the forty years of the wanderings correspond to the forty days between the Resurrection and the Ascension. Moses' and Elijah's role in the narrative is that of announcing Christ's future glory. Consequently Luke's narrative of the Transfiguration is a prefiguration of the Ascension. In Matthew the Transfiguration has a different significance. The glorified Christ appears as the only Teacher of mankind. The law of Christ substitutes for the Law of Moses. Moses and Elijah represent the Law and the Prophets whom Christ came to fulfill. Hence all must listen to Christ. The three Synoptists link up, each in his own way, the Baptism of Christ to His Transfiguration.—P. P. S.

349. S. GAROFALO, " 'Preparare la strada al Signore,' " *RivistBib* 6 (2, '58) 131-134.

A fragmentary papyrus MS of the 3rd century B.C. throws a flood of light on this text (Mt 3:3 parr.). Amennius (or Apennius) of Arsinoe, Egypt, assures Asclepiades that everything is ready for the visit of Chrysippus, the chief of the royal guards and minister of finance. He concludes in these words: "We have prepared also five riding donkeys . . . and fifty asses for the baggage, and have provided for the servicing of the highway."—C. S.

350. R. GAUTHIER, "Existence et nature de la paternité de saint Joseph (fin)," *CahJos* 6 (2, '58) 185-211.

[Cf. §§ 1-412; 2-273, 523; 3-58.] An examination and final summary of the unique meaning of the designation "father" as applied to St. Joseph.

351. J. H. LUDLUM, "New Light on the Synoptic Problem," *ChristToday* 3 (3, '58) 6-9; (4, '58) 10-14.

A brief historical survey of Synoptic source-criticism and a defense of the genuinity and authenticity of the Gospels.

352. D. E. NINEHAM, "Eyewitness Testimony and the Gospel Tradition, II," *JournTheolStud* 9 (2, '58) 243-252.

[Cf. § 3-63.] It cannot be demonstrated from a study of the Gospels that

eyewitness testimony influenced them at the stage of their composition, and the problem is even more difficult to resolve for the earlier period of tradition. The groups of pericopes thought to be historical unities in Mark do not necessarily presuppose eyewitness control. But the opposite conclusion—that there was no eyewitness control—cannot be inferred either. The *a priori* arguments of V. Taylor in favor of eyewitness influence cannot be dismissed lightly. It does seem to us paradoxical that the early Christians could have lost sight of historical accuracy when their faith rested on historical events. But it is clear in John, and also in Matthew and Luke, that the motives of composition were primarily theological and edificatory although the historical form was retained. Why not the same motives in Mark and Q? With our concern for historical accuracy, we would have written the Gospels otherwise. The Evangelists, however, appear to have allowed edification as a legitimate factor even in historical narrative. Origen explicitly remarks that they gave precedence to the “spiritual meaning,” and it has been pointed out concerning the Semitic mind that history was regarded as a very practical tool of theology. Moreover, a consideration of the very limited opportunities for eyewitness control over the tradition further supports the idea that such control was less prominent than has often been assumed.—G. W. M.

Matthew

353. O. BETZ, “Jesu Heiliger Krieg,” *NovTest* 2 (2, '57) 208-223.

In addition to the War Scroll, the Qumran *Hodayot* contain a number of passages (2:20-29; 2:10-16; 6:22-35) which show that the sect was keeping itself in readiness for a holy war. Against the background of a holy war similar to the one depicted in the scrolls, several somewhat obscure sayings of Jesus can be better understood. (1) Mt 11:12. (The Lukan parallel in 16:16 seems to be a misunderstanding and reversal of this saying.) John the Baptist marks a turning-point in the history of salvation: with the arrival of Jesus the holy war is already being waged against the powers of evil. The *biastai* are the “doers of violence,” *ryšym*, of the *Hodayot*. They are all the opponents of the kingdom of God, spirits as well as mortals (e.g., Herod), with Belial at their head. (2) Mt 10:34 ff. This passage apparently alludes to Mic 7:6, but in a different context. It also suggests Deut 33:9. Since the latter occurs in the Qumran Testimonia, it is probable that the sect used it to justify their way of life in the desert, as Christ may have used it to justify the “sword” in the holy war of the NT. (3) Mt 12:40. In the last times many false prophets were expected to arise with signs and wonders to support their claims (*cf.* the descriptions in Josephus). Jesus uses the Sign of Jonah to distinguish Himself from them in revealing how His holy war is fought. Both Jesus and the Qumran sect showed opposition to the Temple and its practices, but Jesus actually cleansed the Temple. Against His chief enemy, the devil, Jesus fights alone both in the desert and on Calvary. His death and Resurrection are His

victory. This pericope shows that the Evangelists present Jesus as fully aware of His approaching death.—G. W. M.

354. D. O. VIA, "The Church as the Body of Christ in the Gospel of Matthew," *ScotJournTheol* 11 (3, '58) 271-286.

The Pauline notion of the body of Christ provides a working definition to be applied to Matthew's Gospel, since both authors drew from the same OT source. The OT resolution of the problem of the one and the many by the term "corporate body" suggested to Paul the parallel between the natural unity of all men in Adam and the spiritual unity of mankind in the new Adam. The Jews expected an eschatological community united in the corporate personality of the Messiah. The Pauline doctrine is implicit in Matthew because of two important notions. (1) The Church is the body of Christ since Christ identified himself with it. The reception of a follower of Christ signifies a reception of Christ Himself. So also, charity given to another pertains to Him. Furthermore, Christ is among those gathered in His name. (2) The Church carries out its ministry in virtue of His presence in the united community. It assumes the right of judgment and of binding and loosing, powers first possessed by Christ. The Church also extends Christ's ministry, since anyone who links himself to Christ shares derivatively in His Messianic function. And in virtue of carrying out His ministry, the Church reveals in itself Christ's suffering on the cross.—F. P. S.

355. [Mt 4:19]. J. MANEK, "Fishers of Men," *NovTest* 2 (2, '57) 138-141.

What is the significance of the term "fishers of men" in Mt 4:19 and Mk 1:17 (cf. Jer 16:16)? The usage must be more than a mere play on words. According to the ancient cosmogonical myths (reflected in Ps 74, Jonah, Revelation), the waters signify the underworld, the place of sin and death and thus of separation from God. To be a fisher of men is to rescue men from the waters. The parallel in Lk 5 does not use the term but employs the same symbolism, which appears also in Jn 21:11; Mt 14:24-33 (Jesus walks on the surface of the water because He is without sin) and Mk 4:36 ff.—G. W. M.

356. [Mt 5:4]. A.-M. COCAGNAC, "Trois méditations sur la douceur évangélique," *LumVie* 7 (38, '58) 98-112.

The word "meek" in Mt 5:4 signifies an original spiritual reality, distinct from the other Beatitudes. C studies this reality: (1) in Wis 10 ff., where it appears as an attribute of God, manifested in history; (2) in the Gospel episode of Palm Sunday, where it is a distinctive mark of Christ as Prophet; (3) in various texts of both Testaments which speak of the "unction" of the Holy Spirit, supernatural source of evangelical meekness. From each of these considerations, C draws certain practical spiritual conclusions.—F. P. G.

Mt 11:11 ff., cf. § 369.

357. [Mt 16:17-19]. E. FLOOD, "One of the Promises to Peter," *ClerRev* 43 (10, '58) 584-594.

Doubt concerning the authenticity of Mt 16:17-19 partly because of its omission by Mark and Luke is now rarely supported; its Semitic character is too evident. The main objection to the historicity of the passage is the use of the term "Church"; but this notion is fundamental to the OT: the congregation of the Covenant-people of God. It is natural that Christ, founding the New Covenant, should speak of His Church, which is a concrete, organized society.

The text contains three strophes, in each of which the first line is the theme of the following two. The first, Simon's blessing, leads Cullmann to suggest that the pericope is not in its correct context. The second proclaims Simon to be the Rock, something impregnable and permanent. In addition to other illustrations of this metaphor, a Qumran psalm speaks of the community as a citadel built on a rock. The Rock ensures that the power of Hades—the incessant attacks of Satan—will not prevail. In the third strophe, Peter's function is delineated in terms of the power of the keys, full authority and leadership. This gives him absolute power over the new community; binding and loosing means either the imposition by authority of its own interpretation of the Law or power to permit entry into or to expel from the community.—L. J.

358. [Mt 27:46]. N. B. BAKER, "The Cry of Dereliction," *ExpTimes* 70 (2, '58) 54-55.

In *ExpTimes* 68 ('57) 260-262 [*cf.* § 2-276], H. C. Read maintained that the cry of dereliction on the cross "shows us absolute Innocence in absolute abandonment." B rejects "absolute abandonment" because it is irreconcilable with the doctrine of the Trinity.—J. J. C.

Mark

359. G. S. SLOYAN, "The Gospel according to St. Mark," *Worship* 32 (9, '58) 547-557.

A popular general introduction to Mark that treats of authorship, composition and portrayal of Christ in the Gospel.

Mk 1:17, *cf.* § 355.

360. G. ZIENER, "Das Bildwort vom Sauerteig Mk 8,15," *TrierTheolZeit* 67 (4, '58) 247-248.

Certain German commentators (K. Staab, E. Lohmeyer, J. Schniewind and J. Schmid) contend that the metaphor of the leaven in Mk 8:15 disrupts the continuity of thought. But excluding v. 15 poses a further problem: Can Christ then rightly accuse the disciples of too great concern for earthly things? This attitude of the disciples requires v. 15, since (1) association of ideas, "leaven-bread," immediately suggests the thought of bread to the disciples; (2) they "keep pondering" (*dielogizonto*) and do not attend to Christ's admonition.—G. K. K.

361. [Mk 10:38]. G. DELLING, "*baptisma baptisthēnai*," *NovTest* 2 (2, '57) 92-115.

What is the meaning of the words *baptisma baptisthēnai* in Mk 10:38 and Lk 12:50? We may adopt as a basis for investigation the fact that the expression is associated with another image in each of the passages. (1) Clearly the phrase in Mk 10:38 is intended as a parallel to the saying about the cup. In the OT (e.g., Hab 2:16) and the NT books (e.g., Apoc 14:10; 16:19) the cup metaphor refers to the wrath of God's judgment. Since the Synoptics regard Jesus as suffering the judgment of God in place of guilty mankind, it is at least possible that the cup metaphor in Mk 10:38 refers to the judgment. The usual interpretations see in the words *baptisma baptisthēnai* a reference either to baptism or to the death of Christ, but these allusions are not clear. A lexical investigation of *baptisma* suggests that it does not mean "baptism" but "immersion." Both profane literature and the OT support the idea that "to be immersed" is figurative language for "to be overwhelmed by disaster or danger."

(2) The parallel structure of vv. 49 and 50 in the Lukan passage makes a parallel in meaning at least possible. In the OT and the NT alike fire is a symbol of the judgment, and OT references show that the image of a "flood of fire" for the judgment is not unknown. In Ps 11:6 we find the two metaphors of fire and the cup mixed as allusions to judgment. Thus, comparing the two occurrences of *baptisma baptisthēnai*, we find the idea of immersion associated with the cup and with fire, both meaning judgment. Thus the phrase means "to be immersed in the fire-flood of judgment," and this meaning fits the Baptist's words in Lk 3:16 (Mt 3:11) as well. The enigmatic Lk 23:31 would also seem to be a reference to the fire of judgment. The meaning of the logion in Mk 10:38 is that the disciples of Christ are to be associated with Him in His Passion, which is His submission to judgment for the sins of men. Col 1:24 expresses Paul's consciousness of this association.—G. W. M.

362. É. DHANIS, "L'ensevelissement de Jésus et la visite au tombeau dans l'évangile de saint Marc (Mc., XV, 40-XVI, 8)," *Gregorianum* 39 (2, '58) 367-410.

Mark contains elements taken from primitive tradition but largely completed by precise, living, personal details which seem to come from the testimony of Peter. What place might the two pericopes (the narrative of Jesus' burial and the visit to the tomb, Mk 15:40—16:8) have had in the primitive tradition? Do these pericopes, at least the second, represent an addition of Mark to the ancient narrative? V. Taylor (*The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London, 1955) joins the burial narrative to the first Passion stories; the visit to the tomb he considers late and legendary in character.

The literary links between the two pericopes and the rest of Mark's Passion narrative are of four kinds. (1) Some connect the narrative of the death of Jesus to His burial (the arrival of evening and the preparation for the Sabbath; the double mention of the centurion; Pilate's surprise). (2) Some connect

the burial narrative with that of the visit to the tomb (allusions to the stone; the women's assistance at the burial and their preparations on Saturday night; the purchase of linen and spices). (3) The angel's message joins the visit to the tomb with the beginning of the Passion history (cf. Mk 14:27-28). (4) The triple mention of two Marys unites the burial narrative to the death of Jesus and the visit to the tomb. That all these links existed before the composition of the second Gospel cannot be proved. Most of them give some indication of such antiquity. Their number and quality suggest that neither all of them nor even those which concern the burial or the visit to the tomb could have been later insertions or due to Mark's editing. The Pauline confession of faith in 1 Cor 15:3b-5 (associated with the catechesis, and made up principally of the ancient passion history and a commentary) gives a direct proof from the NT itself. Mark has a sequence of narratives parallel to that of the first three articles of the Pauline confession; Luke's narrative parallels the fourth article of the same confession. The ancient Passion history must have provided the Evangelists with a model; it must have presented a sequence containing the narratives of Jesus' death, His burial, the manifestation of His Resurrection, and probably—in the form used by Paul and Luke—a narrative of apparitions to Peter and the Twelve. It can be concluded: Mark found these two pericopes in the ancient Passion history.—G. K. K.

Luke

363. J. MANEK, "The New Exodus of the Books of Luke," *NovTest* 2 (1, '57) 8-23.

Each of the Synoptic Gospels records the presence of Moses and Elias at the Transfiguration. In Luke's Gospel alone may be found a more detailed description of the event. Both prophets appear in glory and speak of Jesus' "exodus" which He had to accomplish in Jerusalem. The word *exodos* had a special meaning for Luke (9:31). He alone designates Moses and Elias as "two men." The phrase recurs in another context (24:4) in which the women see the two men at the tomb. To Luke, these two men are not angels. They are Moses and Elias who spoke, at the Transfiguration, of Christ's death and Resurrection as the New Exodus. The Exodus of the OT was historical and prophetic. Thus the early Church considered Christ's death and Resurrection in the prophetic sense, as did Christ Himself (cf. Lk 24:27). Luke, then, fits the Exodus into the background of the Passion. His view of Jerusalem is given in the light of God's judgment into which the town is plunged. Jerusalem is likened to Egypt. The earthly city is related to the heavenly one as the passage through the Red Sea is related to the Promised Land. Luke sees Christ's New Exodus as an act of God, by which all were given the possibility of faith, and by which the enemies of God were to be punished as the Egyptians. Christ's apparitions of forty days have a prototype in the forty years' journey to the Promised Land. Entrance into it is analogous to Jesus' entrance into

heaven. At the heavenly entrance, the two men were present. The Egypt-Palestine antithesis is contrasted with the earthly-heavenly Jerusalem, i.e., sin vs. holiness. The New Exodus is the transition from one city to its heavenly counterpart. The two men are types of Jesus, the leader of the New Exodus.—F. P. S.

364. A. DE ROOVER, "De Evangelii Infantiae (Lc I-II) Chronologia," *Verb Dom* 36 (2, '58) 65-82.

A weak point in the chronology of the Infancy proposed by P. Gaechter in his *Maria im Erdenleben* (Innsbruck, 1955) is his conjecture that the marriage of our Lady and St. Joseph must, for economic reasons, have taken place in the autumn. R thinks, for similar economic reasons, that spring is a more likely time, i.e., about the middle of April. The birth of our Lord would then be in the middle of November, and not, as Gaechter conjectures, in March.—J. F. Bl.

365. [Lk 1:26-38]. D. GOTHARD, "The Annunciation," *Scripture* 10 (12, '58) 116-121.

Did Mary know she was to be the Mother of God from the message of the angel? The literary structure of Lk 1 with its constant Messianic references points to the gradual unfolding of the full revelation of the divine motherhood of Mary, with the final and full revelation in 1:35, a verse pregnant in meaning for one versed in the OT Scriptures.—J. A. R.

366. [Lk 1:28]. E. R. COLE, "What Did St. Luke Mean by *Kecharitomene*?" *AmEcclRev* 139 (4, '58) 228-239.

In order to determine the full meaning of the word *kecharitōmenē* in Lk 1:28, we must examine the rare early instances of its use. This investigation shows that in the early centuries before and after St. Luke, the word was a purely adjectival one, used to describe integrity of body or of spirit according to the context. That the word refers to Mary's perfect spiritual integrity in Lk 1:28 is supported by early patristic exegesis. The ancient versions of the NT found the phrase "full of grace" to be the best rendering of it.—G. W. M.

367. [Lk 1:34]. J. B. BAUER, "Monstra te esse matrem, Virgo singularis!" *MünchTheolZeit* 9 (2, '58) 124-135.

Nowhere in Scripture or in the oldest tradition is there evidence that Mary intended her betrothal to be other than a legal preparation for a normal marriage. Lk 1:34 does not support the postulate that she had a vow of virginity; it merely indicates that she has not yet been introduced into the household of her husband. From the angel's *Ecce concipies* Mary learns that she will now conceive. This form is the equivalent of *hinneh* with a participle meaning an immediate future. It is not surprising that no time particles appear to indicate the immediate future, since Hebrew, which is deficient in

particles, usually relies on context to express accurate time. With her question Mary explains to the angel that this cannot be, because at present she is only betrothed. In NT Greek questions containing *pōs* and a future are to be interpreted as negations. The postulate of a virginal marriage is unwarranted. Attempts to find a basis for such a marriage among the Essenes are futile: there is no evidence of unconsummated marriages in that community; the asceticism of the Essenes was not Christian asceticism; the beginnings of Christianity must be carefully distinguished from them. The postulate of a vow of virginity arose, not from exegetical reflections on Lk 1:34, but from speculation and on the grounds of its fittingness, namely the *Virgo Virginum* should have had a vow of virginity because she is the ideal. On the same grounds of fittingness the opposite can be proved. If Mary acted under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, why was she prepared for virginity and not for motherhood? Theologians are coming to a new appreciation of her motherhood. A healthier exegesis of Lk 1:34 would clear the way. [Cf. § 2-539.]—J. F. F.

368. F. H. SEPER, "*Kai ti thelō ei ēdē anēphthē* (Lk 12:49b)," *VerbDom* 36 (3, '58) 147-153.

The Greek *kai ti thelō ei ēdē anēphthē*, S suggests, is a literal rendering of a Hebrew original *umeh ḥapaštî lu* (not *kî*, as Delitzsch translates it) *kebar ba'erah*. The particle *lu* with the perfect in Hebrew expresses an unfulfilled wish in past time ("How I wish that it were already kindled!"). S thinks that his *lu*-clause can be constructed asyndetically with *ḥapaštî*, on the analogy of verbs of saying.—J. F. Bl.

Lk 12:50, cf. § 361.

369. F. W. DANKER, "Luke 16:16—An Opposition Logion," *JournBibLit* 77 (3, '58) 231-243.

Lk 16:16 ff. and its parallel, Mt 11:11 ff., are usually interpreted as Christ's reaction to the critics of His doctrine of universal forgiveness. A new approach clarifies the passage and its problems. The observation that "everyone is forcing his way into the kingdom" is explained as Christ's expression of an objection made by the Pharisees. This fits into the context of the preceding and following verses of both Evangelists. It is supported by their grammar and the structure of the passages, Matthew's use of his source material, and the change of words from Matthew to Luke. The fact that the words are not introduced as a quotation is explained by the fact that this criticism of Jesus was too well known to require it.—F. C. M.

370. [Lk 22:7-38]. M. ZERWICK, "Praehistoria textus sacri—cui bona?" *VerbDom* 36 (3, '58) 154-160.

H. Schürmann, having completed a detailed and lengthy form-critical analysis of Luke's account of the Last Supper, has now published a brief account of the exegetical and practical results of his analysis (*Der Abendmahlsbericht*

Lucas 22, 7-38 als Gottesdienstordnung, Gemeindeordnung, Lebensordnung, Paderborn, 1957). Z commends the way in which he breaks down Luke's text into its primitive elements, and then suggests a *Sitz im Leben* to account for the community's interest in preserving each and incorporating it into the liturgy. For example, the enigmatic recommendation to buy a sword (Lk 22:36) was incorporated to teach the community that preachers were no longer to go without scrip or purse but to make material provision for their missionary journeys. There was, therefore, a very close connection between the words of the liturgy and the practical life of the Church.—J. F. Bl.

371. C. K. BARRETT, "Luke XXII. 15: To Eat the Passover," *JournTheolStud* 9 (2, '58) 305-307.

Contrary to the assertion of H. Chadwick in *HarvTheolRev* 50 ('57) 249-258 [cf. § 2-541], the phrase "to eat the *pascha*" in Lk 22:15 is a common one, and it means "to eat the Passover lamb." OT, pseudepigraphical and rabbinic passages are cited in support of this statement. The Lukan source behind 22:15, like Mark, considered the Last Supper a paschal meal.—G. W. M.

GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

372. O. MICHEL, "The Fourth Gospel and History," *ChristToday* 3 (4, '58) 15-16.

The Fourth Gospel contains valuable material which helps to delineate the Jesus of history.

373. O. MONTEVECCHI, "Il quarto Vangelo e le scoperte papirologiche più recenti," *ScuolCatt* 86 (4, '58) 264-275.

The papyri of the Fourth Gospel are studied with special attention to Papyrus Bodmer II. Evidently John enjoyed a privileged position, because the ratio of extant papyri to the various NT books is the following: John 15; Matthew 11; Luke 4; Mark 1; Epistles 24; Acts 12; Apocalypse 3.—J. J. C.

374. E. R. SMOTHERS, "Two Readings in Papyrus Bodmer II," *HarvTheol Rev* 51 (3, '58) 109-122.

P⁶⁶ may preserve the original text in its readings "*the prophet*" (7:52) and "*I told you in the beginning that which also I am telling you*" (8:25). [Cf. §§ 2-70, 322, 558; 3-120-123.]

375. C. SPICQ, "Notes d'exégèse johannique. La charité est amour manifeste," *RevBib* 65 (3, '58) 358-370.

In John, as in classical and LXX Greek, *agapē* is principally an out-going, gift-giving, self-proving love. (1) Jn 3:16 emphasizes *agapē* as proper to God and best shown in the Incarnation and Redemption. The *houtōs—hōste* usage stresses a) strict cause-effect procession, b) John's amazement at divine prodigality. Seven examples from classical and biblical Greek prove this

intensifying force of the correlatives. (2) Jn 13:1 shows the immutable divine love revealing itself in new magnificence; while the aorist participle (*agapēsas*) implies all that precedes the paschal meal, the aorist predicate (*ēgapēsan*) points to a climactic gift. *Eis telos* designates the full, unmistakable manifestation of measureless love. (3) Jn 15:13 recognizes the sacrifice of one's life as the best expression of love, although it does not constitute love. (4) In 1 Jn 4:8, 16 ("God is love"), we have no strict definition of God (elsewhere John has also called Him spirit or light), but rather a statement of the most manifest attribute of God (*cf.* vv. 9 and 14). In all of revelation and especially in Christ, God is the showing-forth of love. The concentration of this love in Christ reveals the Father as its source, indeed as being this love. Love shown to men participates in the love of God for His Son. (5) From 1 Jn 4:10-11, we see that not constancy but initiative is the uniquely divine property of love. God spares nothing to render us lovable. Faith confesses that God loves us in this way simply because He is what He is. *Houtōs* (v. 11) expresses contemplative astonishment at the inexpressible actuality and magnificence of that love; such affective usage is borne out by classical Greek and the papyri. The faith which is a gift of self responds to this love; unable, though, to love God as He loves us, the disciple must imitate God's initiative by loving his brethren.—D. H. S.

376. [Jn 1:1-51]. H. DE JULLIOT, "Jésus parmi les siens," *BibVieChrét* 23 ('58) 13-21.

The Word is a "religious of the Father" (Jn 1:1). We are assisting at the birth of history. The divine life will be bestowed upon us through human life and grace (vv. 3-4). To evoke the Word Incarnate is to evoke ingratitude to mercy. The Word will be a scandal for the Jews, folly for the Greeks, the fall of many obstinate souls, and will be rejected by His own from Nazareth and from the Temple (vv. 10-11). Yet everyone can freely be "born of God" through faith (vv. 12-13). "And the Word was made flesh" (v. 14a) is the reversal of "My spirit shall not remain forever, since he is flesh" (Gen 6:3). Grace after grace presses against arid hearts (v. 16). Many false prophets claimed to be similar to Moses (Deut 18:15) and then came the humble John the Baptist (vv. 30, 23). Some of the Fathers saw in Abraham's immolated lamb a figure of Christ (v. 29). The first ones whom Jesus met after John the Baptist were John and Andrew (v. 39). A grandiose image ends this chapter of Jesus among His own: Christ is the true ladder of Jacob because it is *per Ipsum et cum Ipso et in Ipso* that the elect ascend to God from whom descend all blessings.—J. A. G.

377. [Jn 1:3]. T. E. POLLARD, "Cosmology and the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel," *VigChrist* 12 (3, '58) 147-153.

When Gnostics first cited Jn 1:3 as proof for a Platonic cosmogenesis, Christians retorted that a *creatio ex nihilo* was the author's intent. But John

seems to denote here primarily the action of the Logos as mediator of *all* God's activity *ad extra*. Thus 1:3 should read: "All things *happened* through him," in a more inclusive verbal action than the traditional: "All things *were made* through him." John's Gospel theme as a whole is not cosmological, but Christological. Only once in the Prologue does the crucial verb *egeneto* signify beyond dispute an exclusively creative act (1:10); for the rest, it denotes acts related to the Son's redemptive mission. Moreover, in the OT, the Manual of Discipline and the Hymns of Thanksgiving (despite some translations of the scrolls), the more likely Hebrew equivalent to *egeneto*, the Niphal of *hayah*, never seems to denote "come into existence," but rather "come to pass, happen." —K. F. D.

378. A. VIARD, "Singulier ou pluriel dans S. Jean I, 13," *AmiCler* 68 (33-36, '58) 516-520.

The author clearly elects the plural in Jn 1:13 for the following reasons. (1) External criticism shows that *a*) the Greek MSS and the versions clearly favor the plural, and *b*) patristic citations sometimes give the singular (Irenaeus, Tertullian) and sometimes the plural (Augustine, Ambrose). (2) Internal criticism shows that the plural reading does not introduce any incoherence into the sequence of the Prologue, but on the contrary fully corresponds to its character as an introduction to the ensemble of themes developed by the Gospel. —J. D.

Jn 2:13-22, *cf.* § 347.

379. [Jn 4:1-42]. F. ROUSTANG, "Les moments de l'Acte de Foi et ses conditions de possibilité. *Essai d'interprétation du dialogue avec la Samaritaine*," *RechSciRel* 46 (3, '58) 344-378.

The thought in Jn 4:1-42 is parabolic, climaxing in *Ego Eimi* (v. 26). As such, it reverses the parabola of the Prologue by showing, first, the historical growth of a human liberty in the dialogue with the Samaritan woman and then, in the discourse to the disciples, the vertical action of God which makes this possible. Superficial literary analysis shows the two dialogues linked in setting, wording, images and content.

Ascent of the parabola: (disciples leave); visible water; eternal life; adoration of the Father; the Messiah; *Ego Eimi*. Corresponding descent: (disciples return, woman leaves); the Messiah; nourishment and sending from the Father; eternal life; visible harvest; (woman returns).

The four triple replies in the first dialogue exhibit the four moments of the free act of faith: asserting appearances, denying them, excluding them, asserting the truth. (1) In vv. 7-10, the discussion of thirst, human relations, and total human knowledge and power, completes the sphere of appearances. (2) In vv. 11-15, the woman fully desires a good whose content is yet unknown. (3) In vv. 16-18, Christ brings her to exclude this dangerous abstraction by recalling her to herself with the reconciliatory fact of the true husband. (4) The

adoration proposed in vv. 19-24 will reconcile by its universality the interior and exterior worlds. The woman's evocation of the Messiah (v. 25) shows her grasping the import, not the actuality, of Christ's words; v. 26 actualizes her affirmation.

The dialogue with the disciples leads to the first mention of faith; it transforms the woman's question into the affirmation of Christ as Messiah. Vv. 37-38, describing separation of sower and reaper, are intentionally opposed to v. 34 with its picture of Christ as sent, as united in interiority, as having achieved. Vv. 35-36 reconcile these opposing sets by showing harvest-fields now ready, sower and reaper rejoicing together. This reconciliation of eternity and time, unity and separation, completion and preparation, symbolizes the Eucharistic communion of the Church seen baptizing in 4:2. And the double ternary movement of the pericope suggests in two different ways the missions of the Blessed Trinity among men.—D. H. S.

380. [Jn 5:36; 17:4]. A. VANHOYE, "Opera Jesu donum Patris," *VerbDom* 36 (2, '58) 83-92.

Jn 5:36 and 17:4 contain a phrase *erga didonai hina teleiōsō* (*poiēsō*) which gives somewhat different meanings according as the translator assigns greater or lesser value to the individual words *didonai*, *hina* and *teleioun*: the *didonai* can have its full sense, i.e., "to bestow as a gift"; the *hina* does not necessarily have final force; and "the works that my Father has given me to do" does not simply mean "has laid upon me," but, at least in 17:4, "has enabled me to do." Jn 5:36 means "the works that are my Father's gift to me, that I may bring them to their fulfilment . . ."; and Jn 17:4 means "I have glorified thee on earth, having brought to fulfilment the work which thou gavest me power to do."—J. F. Bl.

381. [Jn 9:1-41]. D. MOLLAT, "La guérison de l'aveugle-né," *BibVieChrét* 23 ('58) 22-31.

The "sign" of the man born blind is a Johannine synthesis of Jesus' mission of Light in conflict with Darkness (unbelieving Jews). After commenting on Jn 9:1-7, M indicates that with a symbolic intention John translates Shiloah ("sender") passively, "sent" (which is used as a title of Jesus 40 times in the Fourth Gospel). John wants to show that the Pool of Shiloah, like the Temple, the Pasch, the Sabbath, Israel, derives its true significance from Jesus. The waters of the Pool of Shiloah were also a symbol of the peaceful life of Israel under God's protection, but the people refused it (Isa 8:6). Perhaps John saw in this refusal an announcement of the obduracy of Jesus' Jewish contemporaries.

The feast of Tents was a feast of light, of libations with waters from Shiloah and of Messianic hope. Hence it was an excellent setting for "I am the light of the world" (v. 5) and for the sign of the man born blind. In the presence of the sign there are responses of unbelief—the Jews—and of

faith—the neighbors and the man born blind (vv. 8-34). All during the episode the recipient of the miracle gradually arises to a higher spiritual understanding of the person of his benefactor (vv. 35-38). The purpose of the miracle was to recognize Him who made him see. The “sinner,” the blind man, became the living sign of the man illumined and regenerated by Jesus. He is the testimony of Jesus-Light. For the Jews, the day of salvation becomes a day of judgment (v. 39). Augustine and Ambrose have seen in this cure with the ablutions at the Pool of Shiloah a symbol of baptismal regeneration. There is a foundation in John’s Gospel for this symbolism.—J. A. G.

382. [Jn 18:1-27]. N. KRIEGER, “Der Knecht des Hohenpriesters,” *NovTest* 2 (1, '57) 73-74.

At the arrest of Jesus there were at least two “servants of the high priest” present, Malchus and his relative (Jn 18:26). How then can it be said that Peter cut off the ear of *the* servant of the high priest? It is here suggested that originally Judas was the servant in question, derisively so called by the other disciples because of his treachery. John seems actively to oppose this Synoptic tradition. For him Judas did not negotiate with the high priest, but had been from the beginning chosen for his evil deed. Hence John invented a name for the wounded servant, and his version of the story prevailed.—G. W. M.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

383. J. KAHMANN, “Heilige Geest en Kerk in de Handelingen van de Apostelen” [The Holy Spirit and the Church in the Acts of the Apostles], *NedKathStem* 54 (4-5, '58) 97-113.

The main theme of Acts is the establishment and the expansion of the Church in space and time. This takes place through the action of the Spirit, especially the prophetic Spirit. By the gift received on Pentecost the apostles become the charismatic speakers and witnesses of Christ; that gift is again mentioned at the important stages of the narrative: 8:4-13; 10:44-48 and particularly 19:6. The scene at Ephesus seems to be a parallel to Acts 2:4 ff.; it is the Pentecost of the Pauline churches. In all these texts the emphasis is laid upon the prophetic character of the gift of Pentecost, which is wholly focused on the preaching of the word. In contrast with the OT, this gift is universal and permanent; it operates in the community as a whole and is normally given by the imposition of hands. Two important theological questions arise. (1) The relation of this gift to baptism: in Luke the gift of the Spirit is also called baptism with the Holy Spirit; it is never considered as an effect of baptism itself (not even in Acts 2:38). (2) The texts on the gift of the Spirit furnish a very solid basis for the theology of confirmation: this sacrament gives courage and strength to bear testimony to Christ in defending and propagating the faith. Perhaps all that Luke says about the working of the Holy Spirit in the community life of the Church (fervor, joy, simplicity, gratitude, fear of God, etc.) can very well be linked up with the prophetic gift of confirmation itself.—I. dIP.

384. J.-E. MÉNARD, "Un titre messianique propre au livre des Actes: le *païs theou*," *StudMontReg* 1 (2, '58) 213-224.

French version of an article in *CathBibQuart* 19 (1, '57) 83-92 [cf. § 1-415].

385. R. H. SMITH, "The Eschatology of Acts and Contemporary Exegesis," *ConcTheolMon* 29 (9, '58) 641-663.

NT exegesis is divided between two camps: one holds that history and eschatology are diametric opposites; the other views eschatology as bound up with history. (1) The former group—K. L. Schmidt, R. Bultmann, E. Dinkler, P. Vielhauer, etc.—accuses Luke of historicizing and hence de-eschatologizing the Christian event. The parousia was of no importance for Luke and his generation. (2) For the other school—E. Hoskyns, G. E. Wright, C. H. Dodd, etc.—the central message of the NT is an eschatological act of God in time. History is the workshop of God, and time is the means by which He achieves His saving purpose. Acts agrees with the other works in its eschatology. (3) For H. J. Cadbury, not a member of either group, the eschatology of Acts is given tersely because it is taken for granted.—J. O'R.

386. E. SCHWEIZER, "Zu Apg. 1,16—22," *TheolZeit* 14 (1, '58) 46.

Ph. Menoud's assertion in *RevHistPhilRel* 6 ('57) 71-80 [cf. § 2-85], that the two citations in Acts 1:20 had been linked together by the Greek-speaking community before Luke found them in his source, finds further support in Papias' variation of the story of the death of Judas; the source may, however, have been written, not merely oral.

387. [Acts 27:12]. R. M. OGILVIE, "Phoenix," *JournTheolStud* 9 (2, '58) 308-314.

Using Strabo, Ptolemy, the *Stadiasmus maris magni*, Hierocles, the *Notitiae Graecae Episcop.*, classical remains and topographical considerations, O locates Phoenix in the Cape Mouros region of SW Crete. Although the modern village of Loutro lies round a deep harbor to the east of the mile-long peninsula and its beach faces SE, written evidence demands that the harbor of Phoenix be the west bay, a view not held by the Revised and Knox versions. Geological changes over the centuries explain its present disuse. Only a harbor facing west would afford refuge to Paul's ship and fulfill the description of its aspect as *bleponta kata liba kai kata chōron* (Acts 27:12), since Libs must mean the SW wind.—D. H. S.

EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL

388. J. ADÚRIZ, "El *martyrion* apostólico en las epístolas paulinas," *CienFe* 14 (2-3, '58) 267-268.

Pauline texts show that apostolic *martyrion* is synonymous with *euaggelion*, *kērygma* and *didaskalia*; it is the function of the apostle to mediate between the divine *apokalypsis* and the faith of the believer.

389. J. ADÚRIZ, "El objeto del *pisteuein* cristiano en las epístolas paulinas," *CienFe* 14 (2-3, '58) 195-210.

A study of the terms which Paul uses to describe the object of the *pisteuein* of the faithful reveals that the "obedience to faith" (Rom 16:26-27) which corresponds to the divine revelation of the *mystērion* has as its object the revelation of Christ's Resurrection. Paul certainly includes other truths in the object of faith, but in his mind they are all synthesized in one decisive fact: the Resurrection. It is this which joins the other truths to one another and in this that all belief is somehow included.—P. J. R.

390. R. BARACALDO, "La Gloria de Dios según San Pablo: La Manifestación de la Gloria," *VirtLet* 17 (65-66, '58) 5-24.

[Cf. §§ 1-72, 2-328, 3-129.] B here considers the manifestation of Christ's glory at the Last Judgment and our participation in that glory.

391. P. BOCKEL, "Saint Paul, apôtre de la réconciliation," *BibTerreSainte* 15 ('58) 10-11.

Paul's efforts to reconcile Jew and Gentile and to establish peace between opposing factions can give light to men dealing with racial and caste problems today.

392. A.-M. DENIS, "La fonction apostolique et la liturgie nouvelle en esprit. Étude thématique des métaphores pauliniennes du culte nouveau," *RevSci PhilThéol* 42 (3, '58) 401-436.

For Paul the whole of Christian life is a cult. The apostle's function is to stir up in Christians an awareness of the "cultic" element in their lives. His evangelizing activity itself is described as a cult in which Christians participate or by which they are at least affected. (1) The apostle: *liturgist* of Christ (Rom 15:16). The function of the apostle is to carry out the sacred office of evangelization (*hierourgounta*), to "call to mind" (*epanamimnēskōn*). By their response Christians obtain an ever more perfect grasp of the word of God and with the apostle are able, by their faith, to offer themselves as a pleasing sacrifice. (2) Christian life: building of the spiritual Temple (1 Cor 3:16-17). The apostle lays the foundation (Christ) upon which Christians build with greater or less success and proportionate retribution. The "Spirit of God dwelling in Christians" describes the divine action in a work which perdures. His presence transforms human activity, for it is a new principle of action. The Temple metaphor occurs also in Rom 8:9-11; 1 Cor 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; and Eph 2:20-22, but with no cultic allusion. (3) Apostolic activity: cult of pleasing odor (2 Cor 2:14-17). The apostle, continually humiliated by God, manifests God's triumph and diffuses the sweet odor of knowledge of Christ. This manifestation of Christ by God in and through the apostle can produce a twofold effect (vv. 15-17) and is equivalent to a "judgment." The apostle's activity, which makes Christ known and stirs up faith in Him, is a pleasing odor before God.—A. A. C.

393. L. GOPPELT, "Tradition nach Paulus," *KerDogma* 4 (4, '58) 213-233.

Paul's writings are most valuable for the study of the term "tradition," since he often appeals to tradition, rejects that which is of men, and was a contemporary of the growth of the Synoptic tradition. In his Epistles "tradition" includes: (1) the apostolic kerygma; (2) the Gospel tradition; (3) dogmatic formulas; (4) ethical directives. Of these, (1) and (2) can be called apostolic, while (3) and (4) would be ecclesiastical. From its very nature tradition must be both historical and pneumatic: historical, because based on history and expressed in formulas which can be handed on; pneumatic, because the binding force comes from the witness of the Spirit who confirms, explains and applies tradition.

For the transmission of tradition the entire Church is responsible, although certain individuals may have a prominent part. Nevertheless the concept of tradition in the NT contradicts any principle of succession based on sacramental or juridical grounds.

How has this tradition been preserved for us? The apostolic tradition about the Christ-event and the dogmatic and parenetic tradition directly drawn from it have been transmitted to us only in the NT documents. For by the beginning of the 2nd century extracanonical tradition was unreliable. The tradition therefore concerning the Christ-event must have been committed to writing at the end of the first generation. From this insight into the relation of Scripture to tradition we can realize two points: (1) the tradition from which Scripture developed is the depth dimension of Scripture; (2) as in the past, tradition should be used for the present; i.e., the tradition concerning the Christ-event can and should be applied by the Church to present-day problems.—J. J. C.

394. W. GRUNDMANN, "Die Übermacht der Gnade; Eine Studie zur Theologie des Paulus," *NovTest* 2 (1, '57) 50-72.

The historical significance of Paul consists in this: not only did he understand the gospel as a mission to the nations, but he expressed his understanding in a theology that delineated the concern of the gospel with humanity. He did this by stressing the relation of Christ, the second Adam, to the first Adam. A comparison of the fundamental statement of this relation in Rom 5:12 ff. with 1 Cor 15:20-22, 44b-49, will give us a deeper understanding of Pauline theology.

The juxtaposition of the characteristics of the first Adam with those of the second Adam; the contrast between the "abundance of grace" and the death that "reigned through one man"; the examination of the role of the cross as a prelude to the drama of reconciliation; the difference between the promise made to Abraham, the Law given to Israel and the gospel that "came through a revelation of Jesus Christ"—all lead us to the conclusion that the seriousness of a decision which means life or death depends finally upon belief or unbelief in the message of Jesus Christ for men. Man's incapability of making this

decision and the "abundance of grace" which transcends the thoughts of men led Paul to see, in the history of mankind, God who is all in all.—S. B. M.

395. A. JAGU, "Saint Paul et le Stoicisme," *RevSciRel* 32 (3, '58) 225-250.

In the time of St. Paul Stoicism was the true religion of the wise men of the Empire. It had penetrated down to the lower classes, offering all a rule of life and a formula for happiness. Only a few among the technical terms of Stoicism infiltrated the teaching of Paul, who endowed them with an altogether new religious meaning. On the other hand, he more often adopts its debating tactics, such as the use of contrasts and rhetorical questions. A number of Paul's favorite images—city, house, body, race—can be found in the texts of the Stoic masters. He also seems to have taken into account certain moral or religious themes of Stoicism. (1) The Stoic wishes to establish a *cosmic city* in which the solidarity of men and gods would repose on their common sharing of the same intellectual power and, among men, on the community of nature. Paul also wishes to found a universal city, but to found it on Christ; he preaches equality of men in the sight of God despite social distinctions. (2) Stoicism invited its followers to the acquisition of *liberty*, understood as an internal autonomy and as a liberation from the passions. Paul, enhancing a tendency cultivated by Stoic preaching, invites his hearers to seek a liberty which is death to sin and submission to Christ. (3) Cultivating a proud *self-sufficiency*, the wise Stoic believes he possesses in himself the power necessary to resist evil passions and sustain the trials of life. He believes himself the equal of the gods. This moral climate would perhaps explain why Paul so vigorously describes the insufficiency of the Christian, who looks to God for the will and the force to act (Phil 2:13; 2 Cor 3:4-6). (4) The Stoics often teach that the contemplation of the universe leads to the recognition of the existence of the gods, a theme paralleled in Paul (Acts 17:22 ff.; Rom 1:18 ff.; 2:14-16). In conclusion one may say that Paul is quite familiar with the themes of the Cynic-Stoic philosophy and that he employed Stoic thought, especially its moral system, to secure the acceptance of his preaching. But his rabbinical background influenced him much more than his Hellenistic formation, and his theology, properly so called, is as little Hellenistic as possible.—P. E. L.

396. C. KEARNS, "The Church the Body of Christ according to St. Paul," *IrEcclRec* 90 (1, '58) 1-11; (3, '58) 145-157.

I. While the description of the union between Christ and the faithful in terms of head, body and members is proper to St. Paul in the NT, the doctrine is found throughout the other books, expressed in other terms. Before making use of the figure of the human body, Paul already possessed the doctrine of the vital unity of the faithful with Christ by faith, baptism and grace. To expound and develop this doctrine, Paul borrowed from contemporary Hellenistic literature and philosophy the figure of a society or community pictured as

an organism similar to the human body. Paul transformed and ennobled this figure, to make it express the characteristic doctrine that the faithful are united under Christ, not merely because He is their ruler, but also because they all, by sacramental union with Christ's own body, share supernaturally in the divine life of Christ Himself.

II. In the major Pauline Epistles, taken in chronological order, references to the doctrine are clearly to be found in Gal 3:26-29; and in 1 Cor 6:15-17; 10:14-22; 12; Rom 12, the actual terminology concerning Christians as members of Christ is to be found.—J. A. O'F.

397. S. LYONNET, "La valeur sotériologique de la résurrection du Christ selon saint Paul," *Gregorianum* 39 (2, '58) 295-318.

The Greek Fathers from Origen to Theophylact and many Latins, such as Hilary and Augustine, accepted the causal nexus affirmed by St. Paul between Christ's Resurrection and the Christian's justification. In later centuries, however, certain Latin authors questioned this association. Thus Ambrosiaster conceived the Resurrection as a mere conferring on Christ's precepts an authority which otherwise would have been lacking, while Pelagius saw it merely as an indispensable condition for confirming His followers.

To prescind from the Resurrection risks making Christ's death appear more as the acquittal of a debt than as a victory. That is why Scripture and the Fathers, as well as St. Thomas, avoided constructing their synthesis of the redemption exclusively on the consideration of meritorious causality. Thomas has ordered everything around the efficient instrumental causality of Christ's humanity, which became the instrument of divinity by passing successively through all the mysteries of life, death and glorification. Thus, for Aquinas, the Resurrection and the Ascension, like the Passion, are an essential element of redemption. Later exegetes, such as Cajetan and Toletus, maintain that the Resurrection is an essential element in subjective redemption but plays no part in objective redemption. But does this distinction necessarily force us to dissociate Christ's death from His Resurrection? Rather, does it not permit us to associate them in one and the same mystery as the Scriptures do?

From 1 Cor 15 it is clear that Paul could not conceive of Christ independently of His Resurrection. According to 1 Cor 15:20, objective redemption is effected by the return of humanity to God, accomplished in the death and Resurrection of Christ. According to Rom 6:3-4, subjective redemption is effected in each Christian who dies and rises with Christ through baptism. Thus Paul could declare that Christ "was delivered up for our sins, and rose again for our justification" (Rom 4:25).—J. G. C.

398. C. C. RYRIE, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Church," *BibSac* 115 (457, '58) 62-67.

The primary emphasis of Pauline ecclesiology is on, not the outward organizational aspect, but the inward unity of the Church, achieved by the binding power of the Spirit.

399. R. F. SURBURG, "Pauline *Charis*: A Philological, Exegetical and Dogmatical Study," *ConcTheolMon* 29 (10, '58) 721-741; (11, '58) 812-822.

I. *Charis* in classical Greek did not anticipate its Christian meaning, nor is there any development of its meaning in the LXX. Philo and other Hellenistic writers remain within the confines of earlier usage or extensions of it. Imperial inscriptions of the first century use *charis* for the imperial favor shown by a benefaction to a community. At times Paul uses *charis* in its classical sense of thankfulness. Paul's special use of *charis* refers to the mind of God as manifested towards sinners, His redemptive mercy. It is *favor Dei*. *Charis* depicted as originating in God and mediated through Jesus cannot be identified with the person of the Holy Spirit. The manifestation of *charis* was an act of self-sacrifice on Christ's part; it is abundant, universal, and spontaneously given by God. In a derived sense Paul uses *charis* for a particular application of God's grace.

II. Roman Catholic theology, in failing to maintain the sharp distinction of *charis* as God's unmerited favor and grace as a gift of God, introduced confusion into the article of justification by faith.

Paul relates *charis* to revelation, anthropology, Christology, soteriology, ecclesiology, eschatology. The Pauline conception that grace is *favor Dei propter Christum* and that all the gifts of the Christian life are its result is the hub around which all other Christian truths revolve.—J. O'R.

400. F. R. SWALLOW, "'Redemption' in St. Paul," *Scripture* 10 (9, '58) 21-27.

The common theory of the background of Pauline "redemption" is based upon the pagan practice of sacred manumission of slaves. Similarities of terminology are a strong argument in its favor, but there are three important aspects of manumission that cannot be verified in Paul's teaching on redemption: (1) there is no master to whom God had relinquished His dominion over man; (2) the slave cannot acquire the means of his own redemption; (3) the "ransom" that is Christ's sacrifice is not paid to anyone. The manumission theory is therefore inadequate, and we must turn to the OT for the background of Paul's thought. There we find the liberation of the Israelites from Egypt consistently depicted as a "redemption," without any notion of a ransom paid to the power from which deliverance is made. St. Paul adapted this biblical notion of redemption to express Christ's redemption of man by the divine power He possesses.—G. W. M.

Romans, 1 Corinthians

401. F. SPADAFORA, "Un centenario: la lettera ai Romani," *PalCler* 37 (21, '58) 1107-10.

An outline of the theme and the historical background of the Epistle.

402. S. SCHULZ, "Die Anklage in Röm. 1,18-32," *TheolZeit* 14 (3, '58) 161-173.

The evaluation of the Qumran finds has led to a re-examination of many NT problems, and the pericope Rom 1:18-32 and its sources is no exception. The section contains material for preaching, and parallels are found in Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism and in late apocalyptic Judaism. In both words and matter the locus has affinities with Stoic-Hellenistic thought, and one cannot fail to perceive here echoes of OT terminology. But most extensive are the similarities with late Jewish apocalyptic which had already been influenced by Hellenistic Wisdom literature. Furthermore, in these circles (e.g., 1QS 4:9-14) the idea of adequate recompense is a commonplace.

Several traditions, therefore, have contributed to the formation of Rom 1:18-32: the Stoic-Hellenistic, the late Jewish-Hellenistic, the OT and the Jewish apocalyptic (or "heterodox" movements such as Qumran). But the proximate source must be the Jewish apocalyptic or "heterodox" milieu which had been Hellenized before the time of Paul. The Apostle, however, did not take over the material bodily, but modified it, for while the main patterns were constant, these could be presented differently in accord with the audience addressed. Finally, the tradition upon which our pericope is based seems to have originated in early Christian communities into which Jewish and Gentile converts brought the patterns and thought development of apocalyptic Judaism and of Hellenistic Stoicism respectively.—J. J. C.

403. [Rom 5:12-21; 7:7-25]. J. M. GONZÁLEZ RUIZ, "El pecado original según San Pablo," *EstBíb* 17 (2, '58) 147-188.

In the light of the meaning given by the OT, the Qumran scrolls and the Synoptics to *a*) sin, as an objective separation from God which can also affect the persons related to the sinner, and *b*) death, as an evil corruption of nature, not wanted by God and linked by Him to a definite sin, the exegesis of Rom 5:12-21 leads to the following conclusions. (1) The personal transgression of Adam opened the door to sin, which is presented as the personified lord of this world, the enemy of God, to whom every man after Adam must be subject. (2) Sin brought along death, its own fatal consequence, as a result of a special decree of God imposing death as a punishment of Adam's transgression. (3) Furthermore, the fact that everybody dies presupposes as a condition the fact that everybody has sinned: in v. 12 *eph' hō* must be interpreted with Lyonnet as "on the condition that." (4) But, against Lyonnet, the *hēmarton* in the same verse must be understood as referring to man's sinful relation with Adam rather than to personal sins, as proved by vv. 13-14: the fact that men also died during the lawless period of history between the expulsion from the Garden and the Law of Moses, in which no positive decree of God linked death to personal sins, means that man's death was the result of his participation in Adam's transgression to which a death penalty had actually been attached. (5) The comparison between Adam and Jesus in vv. 14-21 postulates

that as Jesus, through His grace, is presented as the universal cause of eternal life, so Adam be considered, through his transgression, the universal cause of death.

Rom 7:7-25, if interpreted with Lyonnet as echoing Gen 3, is in complete accord with the preceding exegesis and leads to the conclusion that the nature of this sin, which every man (the *egō* of this pericope) derives from Adam, is not concupiscence but an inner "soteriological impotency": the natural incapability that fallen man has for doing the whole good that he wants to do.—L. I. R.

404. J. KÜRZINGER, "*Typos didachēs* und der Sinn von Rom 6,17 f.," *Biblica* 39 (2, '58) 156-176.

The writer examines the various renderings and interpretations of the expression *typos didachēs* in Rom 6:17. The deciding factor, he says, is neither grammar nor vocabulary, but the logical and psychological context. Now the general background of ch. 6 is the state of slavery. The whole chapter abounds in words and expressions which, taken in a juridical sense, denote the various relations between master and slave. The Christian, by means of baptism, has become the property of a new master, or has been transferred from the service of one master to that of another. This is especially clear in v. 18. The Christian has been delivered from the servitude of sin to serve that "type of doctrine" to which he has been given up. This brings the meaning of the expression *typos didachēs* in close connection with baptism. The prepositional expression *eis ton typon* means "(you have obeyed) in view of the type of doctrine" not "to the type of doctrine." The word *typos* has a wide range of meanings: mark, model, form, etc., and the word *didachē* denotes here Paul's teaching or his message of faith. Hence *typos didachēs* means "fundamental form of doctrine" (*Grundformel der Lehre*), and is a circumlocution of the knowledge which he who is to be baptized must have and by which he frees himself from the servitude of sin to pass over to the subjection of righteousness. K concludes that there was only one type of doctrine common to the whole Church, which had its origin from the apostles, which was closely connected with baptism and had its formal expression in the Apostles' Creed.—P. P. S.

405. T. WORDEN, "Christ Jesus Who Died or rather Who has been Raised Up (Rom. 8:34)," *Scripture* 10 (10, '58) 33-43.

In the OT God had "raised up" His people after their repeated falls and had also "raised up" for them saviors such as Moses and David. The Messianic hope of the Jews grew to lie in God's "raising up" for them a future savior who would really accomplish the task that was still incomplete. In the NT we find the earliest apostolic preaching centered about the fact that God has raised up Jesus from the dead and thus has fulfilled Messianic hopes. The apostles appeal to faith in the risen Christ who has brought about a salvation

which is both an accomplished event and a future reality for the believers. St. Paul also stresses both aspects of this paradox. Salvation is salvation from death; by His Resurrection Christ has conquered death, and as surely as Christ rose, men will rise with Him (1 Cor 15). Whether we express our salvation in the past, present or future, we are correct, but no single temporal expression adequately describes the reality.—G. W. M.

406. G. J. JEFFREY, "Paul's Certainties: VIII. The Love of God in Christ—Romans viii. 38, 39," *ExpTimes* 69 (12, '58) 359-361.

Paul's exulting assurance in Rom 8:38-39 is corroborated in our own experience. St. Paul begins with the most divisive power of all, "death"; here the lives of some men and women, through their mortal self-giving and resurrection above the darkness of doubt, above the narrowness of life, confirm what our experience verifies, that our assurance of immortality is never stronger than when our lives are ardently committed to Christian service. Paul's second conviction, that "life itself" could not separate him from the love of God in Christ Jesus, is proved by the history of friendship in our lives. Other possible agents of separation, "angels and principalities and powers," find their antidote in the life of abundant service; "things present and things to come" are shattered on the rock of Paul's confidence that Christ "knew what was in man"; "height and depth" of the undulation between spiritual exaltation and heart-rending anxiety find their constancy in the realization that man's extremity is God's opportunity; and finally "any other creature" is rendered helpless in Paul's lived conviction that "he shall not be afraid of evil tidings: his heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord."—S. B. M.

407. [Rom 9-11]. W. LEONARD, "The Jewish Enigma in the Epistle to the Romans," *AusCathRec* 35 (3, '58) 202-211.

In the form of a Targum or paraphrase L has Paul himself give an elucidation of Rom 9-11, which deal with the enigma of the Jewish people standing outside the regime of salvation established by their own Messiah.

408. M.-F. LACAN, "Les Trois qui demeurent (*I Cor.* xiii, 13)," *RechSciRel* 46 (3, '58) 321-343.

I Cor 13:13 should be translated: "However (*nuni de*) there remain these three, faith, hope and charity, but the greatest of these is charity." Verse 8a should conclude the section 13:4-8a and read: "Charity never falls," thus completing the four preceding assertions and emphasizing the fourth. *Piptei* as "passes away" is unprecedented in Paul and forces translation of *nuni* in a temporal sense to fit the context asserting the preeminence of charity. Other grounds exist for the preeminence of charity than perdurance in vision while faith and hope pass away.

Defined as theological virtues, faith and hope contain the conditions of the state of trial as constituent elements; therefore vision excludes faith and hope in so far as they are meritorious acts. But Paul's notions of faith and hope are broader notions drawn from the OT, fixed inseparably in a triad with charity, and all three renewed in the New Covenant in Christ. Faith is acceptance of the alliance, analogous to espousals, which God offers men. By faith men advance to true, intimate, concrete knowledge of God. In the NT context it is an attitude of confidence and fidelity in responding to a new appeal from God. To believe is to know that Jesus is Lord. It is not only acceptance by the intellect of the truth He reveals but accepting Him to dwell in our hearts. Hope is constancy in expectation of salvation from God and looks forward trustingly to that full communion with God which is its object. Faith leaves us open to the charity of God. The reception of this charity is a permanent attitude. The act perdures in the attitude of fidelity, the state of perfect openness to God. Vision, far from excluding such an attitude, renders it indefectible and excludes only that element of faith by which it is limited to the period of trial during which faith is exercised in obscurity, charity in patient endurance, and hope in expectation. The expectation of hope is replaced by joy in realized communion with God.—A. A. C.

409. P. WINTER, "I Corinthians XV 3b-7," *NovTest* 2 (2, '57) 142-150.

E. L. Allen in *NTStud* 3 ('57) 349-353 [cf. § 2-253] has opened the question of the *Sitz im Leben* of the christophanies in 1 Cor 15:5-7, to which an answer is suggested here. 1 Cor 15:3b-7 is a unit of traditional matter preceded by an introductory formula and followed by Paul's personal testimony. Does this passage represent the tradition in its earliest form or has it been altered by further tradition or by Paul? Verses 3b-4 seem to be a very early creedal formula (cf. Lk 24:46-47). But vv. 5-7 are not found in the creeds. Allen is correct in suggesting that the word *hendeka* in v. 5 is a scribal "correction" of the traditional *dōdeka*, which refers to the same group as the *apostoloi* of v. 7. They are not mentioned twice because of their importance (as Allen has it), but each occurs in a separate series of christophanies. Allowing for v. 6b being an addition to the kerygma by Paul, we find an imperfect parallelism in the christophanies mentioned. Paul may have altered an original *eita tois apostolois kai pasin tois adelphois* in the second series (v. 7) to *eita tois apostolois pasin*, in order to avoid mentioning again the "five hundred" more accurately referred to in the first series. Perhaps Paul originally had at hand two separate reports of the same appearances: Cephas—the Twelve—over five hundred brethren; James—the apostles—all the brethren. The two reports would have stemmed from sources that gave precedence to Peter and to James respectively. There is other evidence for the existence of an early Palestinian tradition that attributed the primacy to James.—G. W. M.

410. P. DACQUINO, "I destinatari della lettera agli Efesini," *RivistBib* 6 (2, '58) 102-110.

So far there is no unanimity as to the destination of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The proper solution of the problem would be to take all the positive elements of the several theories and try to reconcile them; these elements are: the absence of any personal note in the Epistle; the connection with Laodicea (*cf.* Col 4:16); the featuring of the name Ephesus in tradition; the absence of the formulary customary in circular letters. The Epistle is really a doctrinal treatise meant to be circulated among the Christian communities of Asia Minor (Col 4:13-16; *cf.* 1 Thes 5:27), threatened by the erroneous doctrines centering around Colossae. Ephesus, the mother church of these churches, comes into the picture in so far as the letter was found preserved there when the *Corpus Paulinum* was in the process of formation.—C. S.

441. J. A. WITMER, "Paul's Trinitarian Epistle," *BibSac* 115 (459, '58) 247-257.

The contemporary emphasis upon the doctrine of the Trinity invites a re-examination of the biblical evidence for it; Ephesians is particularly rich in such evidence.

412. P. DACQUINO, "Filii lucis in Eph. 5,8-14," *VerbDom* 36 (4, '58) 221-224.

D interprets Eph 5:13-14a [RSV: "But when anything is exposed by the light it becomes visible, for anything that becomes visible is light"] to mean: "It is evident that all these things are to be reprehended by those who are of the light (i.e., Christians); for everything that is manifest (i.e., a good life) befits the light (i.e., Christians)."—J. F. Bl.

413. W. BARCLAY, "Great Themes of the New Testament. Philippians ii. 1-11," *ExpTimes* 70 (1, '58) 4-7; (2, '58) 40-44.

I. St. Paul expresses three reasons for writing to the Philippian Church: (1) to clear up any misunderstanding about the return of Epaphroditus (2:25-30); (2) to thank the Philippians for their gift (4:10-18); and chiefly (3) to exhort them to a life of Christian unity (2:1-11). He explains what this ideal is in a series of vivid phrases which are analyzed here.

II. The means of attaining the ideal of unity and the model to be followed, which is Christ, are brought out in a further series of key words and phrases, which are also analyzed individually here. *Harpagmos* is taken in an active sense: Jesus Christ did not consider His own equality with God as an act of seizure and of plundering, since that equality was His by right. In the title *Kyrios* there are six stages of meaning which should be combined to express what a man means when he speaks of the Lord Jesus.—J. J. C.

414. S. TROMP, "‘Caput influit sensum et motum.’ Col. 2, 19 et Eph. 4, 16 in luce traditionis," *Gregorianum* 39 (2, '58) 353-366.

Investigation of the medical terminology of Hippocrates and Galen clarifies the obscure Vulgate text of Col 2:19 and Eph 4:16, where Christ's influence in His Church is described by analogy to the relation of the human head to the body. The theory of the head as central to the nervous system was known to St. Paul (Col 4:14) and the later Greek Fathers. St. Jerome, however, had before his eyes as the point of comparison not the nervous but the circulatory system. Thus for Jerome to convey the meaning of the metaphor in translation was difficult, not to say impossible. The Scholastics, adhering to the Greek tradition, took these Pauline texts as the scriptural foundation of the famous expression: *Caput influit sensum et motum*. The reasons why Christ is said to be the Head of the Church and the Church the Body of Christ are given by Richard a Mediavilla in *Comm. Libr. Sent.* III d. 13, art. II q. 1. In his synthesis, Richard describes the relations between the head and the body and uses them to illuminate the Headship of Christ.—G. K. K.

415. W. A. SCHULZE, "Ein Bischof sei eines Weibes Mann . . . Zur Exegese von 1. Tim. 3,2 und Tit. 1,6," *KerDogma* 4 (4, '58) 287-300.

The Pauline statement that a bishop (priest) should be a man of one wife is understood by many recent Protestant scholars as forbidding remarriage after the death of the first wife; this exegesis is official for the Catholic Church and has strong support in the ancient canons and in the Fathers. On the other hand, the Antiochene patristic school, all early orthodox Protestantism and not a few Protestant authors of today interpret the text as a prohibition of polygamy. In support of the first opinion Tertullian and Jerome appealed to the alleged practice of pagan cults which would not accept for their priesthood a man who had been married more than once—a practice which historical study has proved to be non-existent. Of no value also for the interpretation (second marriage) is the appeal to Roman burial inscriptions praising a woman as *univira*, for these epitaphs only reflect the egotism of the husband who did not wish his wife to remarry after his death, and, significantly enough, inscriptions are lacking which praise a man for not remarrying after the death of his wife. Confirmation for the interpretation which understands that Paul is excluding from Church offices a man who has more than one wife at the same time, comes from the contemporary low esteem for marriage among pagans and Jews (prevalence of polygamy, etc.). Furthermore, the context of the Pastorals favors this view, since these Epistles have a tone hostile to asceticism. As a further variation of the traditional Protestant exegesis, some writers, e.g., F. Godet, J. Jeremias, A. Oepke, understand that Paul means: a cleric who has divorced his wife should not marry again as long as she is living. Against this opinion, however, is the fact that the term *digamos* in canon law is never given this meaning.—J. J. C.

416. W. BARCLAY, "Paul's Certainties. VII. Our Security in God—2 Timothy i. 12," *ExpTimes* 69 (11, '58) 324-327.

The Greek *parathēkē* ("that which I have committed") epitomizes the noblest ancient thought on honor and honesty. "The typical picture in the word is that of a man going upon a journey and depositing with, and entrusting to, a friend his most precious and valued possessions." From the Code of Hammurabi, Exodus and Leviticus, the Grecian Glaucus legend and the letters of Pliny, we gather that "to be faithful to such a trust, and to return such a deposit unharmed, were amongst the highest and most sacred obligations which ancient thought recognized." This sacred duty, Paul here places upon God. He may refer, as elsewhere (Acts 14:23; 20:32), to his converts, whom he now entrusts to God. Use of *en parathēkē* in the manumission temple ritual suggests this meaning. Or he may intend his own gospel, the *parathēkē* being entrusted to Timothy. Both of these interpretations are possible. Yet, "we think that Paul is here meaning nothing less than his own life and his own soul." Peter's appropriation of the idea for those suffering persecution (1 Pt 4:19) and Christ's use of the expression from the cross, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," make this latter meaning "well nigh certain." Behind Paul's profound security lies his sense of God's utter reliability (*pistos*, passively) and of Christ's effective power (*dynatos*), his own life's experience of trial and suffering, his personal relationship with, and in, Christ, and his awareness that his confidence transcends the world and reaches to the eternal. Paul's Christian security meant "security in all the chances and changes of time and in the judgment of eternity."—R. L. R.

417. [2 Tim 4:7]. J. J. TWOMEY, "I Have Fought the Good Fight," *Scripture* 10 (12, '58) 110-115.

The interest of St. Paul in sporting terminology (1 Cor 4:9; 7:31; 9; Heb 10:32-33; 12:1; 2 Tim 2:5; 4:7; etc.) shows his readiness to make use of terms well known and interesting to the people of his time. One example of his use of sporting metaphor is 2 Tim 4:7. The terminology suggests a long-distance race for which an entrance fee is required, returnable upon completion of the course. At the present time when the world shows such a great interest in sport, perhaps we should make more use of Paul's method.—B. A.

418. P. TEODORICO, "Il sacerdozio celeste di Cristo nella lettera agli Ebrei," *Gregorianum* 39 (2, '58) 319-334.

While recognizing the eminently sacerdotal act of Christ on the cross, Hebrews fixes attention on the priesthood Christ exercises in heaven. There are two moments (or periods) in His priesthood: expiation of sin and a continued act of mercy and aid to men. Heb 5:10 seems to place God's proclamation of Jesus as High Priest at a moment posterior to His earthly experience

as a sort of recompense and crowning of it. Priest from the moment of His Incarnation when engrafted into the human race as new Adam, He consented to be its legitimate representative; priest above all at the moment of His bloody sacrifice, He receives solemn acknowledgement of it when He enters into glory, i.e., into the ideal condition to exercise an eternal priesthood and intercede by means of His immolated and glorified humanity in behalf of men. The Ascension represents the moment in which and the condition by which Jesus' priesthood becomes heavenly.

The celestial sacrifice Jesus offers is a real sacrifice. (1) To interpret the contrast between heavenly and earthly priest as signifying only the superiority of Christ's priesthood over the Levitic would lead to an allegorism which, once applied, could go so far as to consider Christ's Ascension into heaven and the heavenly sanctuary purely symbolic also. (2) By analogy to the sacrifice by which the covenant of Sinai was sealed and the Tabernacle consecrated, and with allusion to the rites of the Day of Atonement (*cf.* 9:18-22 with 9:23 ff.), a real sacrifice would necessarily take place in consecrating the heavenly sanctuary Christ entered. The notion of purification would be omitted from this latter for *a*) 9:23b omits mention of purification in regard to the heavenly sacrifice, or *b*) *katharizō* could be taken as "inaugurate" or "consecrate." (3) Jesus entering heaven bears in His own glorified humanity His blood shed in the sacrifice of the cross which is presented by Him or continually offered to expiate the sins of mankind and apply the fruits of redemption to individual souls. This presentation gives the celestial liturgy its sacrificial character.—A. A. C.

419. P. TEODORICO, "Un' antica esegesi di *Ebrei*, 12, 23: 'Chiesa di primogeniti,'" *RivistBib* 6 (2, '58) 166-173.

Exegetes are far from agreement as to the interpretation of "Church of the firstborn" (Heb 12:23). The phrase certainly denotes a collectivity either of the faithful on earth or of the just in heaven or of both. The point of departure is the expression "registered in heaven" (Lk 10:20; Phil 4:3; Apoc 13:18; 17:18; *cf.* Ps 68:29; Isa 4:3; Dan 12:1), used of the faithful of this world. *Prōtotokos* is never used of angels; it is used of Christ as the Son of God in Heb 1:6 and, without references to brethren, in Rom 8:9; Col 1:15, 18; Apoc 1:5. He made Himself like His brethren when He redeemed man (Heb 2:10, 18; 3:6; 4:15; 5:1-10; 2:11-17; 12:23), hence they share His prerogatives, including His primogeniture. The faithful take the place of Esau, who gave up his birthright for a meal (Heb 12:6). The Christian Church is the new Israel, taking the place of the old one, the firstborn of God (Exod 4:22; Sir 36:11). The Greek and Latin Fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries saw in the phrase the community of the just in heaven; but there is another allusion to this text in Irenaeus in the 2nd century. The Lord has saved us, giving a numerous posterity to the Church, the assembly of the firstborn (*The Demonstration of the Apostolic Teaching*, 94). Clement of Alexandria speaks clearly

of the *Ekklēsia prōtotokōn* quoting Heb 12:23 (*A Hortatory Address to the Greeks*, IX, 82, 6). This interpretation directly concerns the faithful on earth, without excluding those in heaven.—C. S.

CATHOLIC EPISTLES, APOCALYPSE

420. [Jas 1:17]. H. GREEVEN, "Jedes Gabe ist gut," *TheolZeit* 14 (1, '58) 1-13.

It has long been recognized that the first seven words of Jas 1:17 are a hexameter. The reason for it is probably that the author was quoting; this he indicates by using *mē planasthe* (1:16), which appears also in 1 Cor 6:9; 15:33; Gal 6:7 and seems to be an introductory formula for a citation. What does the citation mean? It is commonly assumed that the hexameter provides a double subject for *anōthen estin* (*katabainon*). In that case *mē planasthe* introduces a sentence which is first poetry, then prose. But taken independently, the hexameter can mean: "Every gift is good and every present is perfect." The parallel passages give weight to this interpretation. It is likely, then, that in 1:17 *anōthen* begins a new sentence which gives the reason why every gift is good—because it comes down from above. One can scarcely avoid the exegetical inferences of this interpretation by saying that although James cited the hexameter, he gave it a different meaning; such a change of a well-known proverb would only have puzzled, and perhaps amused, the readers.

Against the view that the worth of a gift is to be measured by its cost, or its purchasing value, the Greek proverb states that its worth lies in the sentiment which it expresses. It reminds one that he must consider not *what* has been given, but that it has been *given*. Does this meaning fit the context here? The proximate context begins in 1:13. First, the view that temptations come from God is repudiated; then comes the hexameter. The appeal to the brethren (v. 16) does not introduce a new theme; as in 2:5 it is the transition to a new consideration on the theme already discussed, for in the NT *mē planasthe* is always connected with what precedes it. If one takes the hexameter as an independent sentence, the continuity of thought is easily established. The maxim "Every gift is good and every present is perfect," properly understood, applies principally to God, the giver of all gifts. James reveals the profundity of the proverb when he refers *pasa dosis* and *pan dōrēma* to God, by saying that "it comes down from above." Every gift is good because God, who gives all, gives it. The maxim of human wisdom is grounded, in the last analysis, in the generous goodness of God. This interpretation makes the omission of "nothing evil comes from God" understandable; the application of the proverb to God is the proof of that, and so there is no need to state it expressly.

If the maxim is true of men, it is all the more so of God. And the Father of lights will not unleash against us the powers of darkness; the Unchangeable One will not suddenly change His mind and visit His creatures with the affliction of temptation rather than with the word of truth. Paraphrased,

Jas 1:17 should be understood somewhat as follows: "Make no mistake, dear brothers! You know the proverb, 'Every gift is good and every present is perfect.' Why? Because it comes down from above, from the Father of lights. . . ."—M. B.

421. C. E. B. CRANFIELD, "The Interpretation of I Peter iii. 19 and iv. 6," *ExpTimes* 69 (12, '58) 369-372.

In the exegesis of 1 Pt 3:19 the three main questions to be answered concern: (1) the meaning of the "spirits in prison"; (2) the time of Christ's preaching to them; (3) the content of that preaching. It is most likely that the *nekroi* of 1 Pt 4:6 are to be identified with, or include, the *pneumata* of 1 Pt 3:19, and that in both verses there is question of preaching done by Christ. The best explanation of the two grammatically coordinate clauses of the latter half of 1 Pt 4:6 would make the former clause subordinate to the latter in meaning, and thus equivalent to a concessive clause—an explanation which is difficult, but probably not impossible.

What, then, is the doctrine of these extremely perplexing verses? Unlike Calvin, we believe that these verses refer to a preaching by Christ to the souls of unbelievers who died in the Flood. And, unlike Windisch, Beare, *et al.*, we believe that this interpretation reflects a very natural double inference on the part of the early Christians: *a*) in the interim between His death and Resurrection the spirit of Jesus must have sojourned in Hades; *b*) He must have been active as the Savior of the world. This latter inference is a hint for us, too, that pagans of subsequent ages are not outside the scope of Christ's mercy.—E. R. C.

422. P. SUITBERTUS, "Die Vollkommenheitslehre des ersten Johannesbriefes (I)," *Biblica* 39 (3, '58) 319-333.

In this first part the writer deals with fellowship with God, which John brings out in such expressions as: to have the Father, the Son; to have eternal life; to abide in God; God abides in the Christian; to be the son of God. Fellowship with God consists in likeness to God. Therefore the Christian must live in light and not in darkness, because God is light and there is no darkness in Him (1:5); he must walk as He walked (2:6); he must abide in Him. Another mark of fellowship with God is love: God is love (4:8); love is from God (4:7); love must consist in deed and in truth, not in words (3:18); we must love one another because God has loved us (4:11). In conclusion, fellowship with God means: to be what He is.—P. P. S.

1 Jn 4:8, 10-11, 16, *cf.* § 375.

423. J. GIBLET, "De revelatione Christi gloriosi in Apoc. I, 9-20," *CollMech* 43 (5, '58) 495-497.

The verses in Apoc 1:9-20 are important for Christology. They depict, according to St. John, Christ's extraordinary dignity and power—Christ as

Priest, King, Pontiff and Lord of death and hell. Verses 14-16 portray Christ's glorified humanity with similes often found in the prophets: e.g., Dan 7:9, Ezek 43:2. The "stars" in v. 16 refer to the bishops of the Church. Verses 17-18 suggest the eternal life of the Son of God, His propitiatory death and, finally, His glorious Resurrection. Verse 19 contains John's mission to transmit this vision to posterity.—A. H. P.

424. E. RUSSELL, "A Roman Law Parallel to Revelation Five," *BibSac* 115 (459, '58) 258-264.

In describing the scene in Rev 5, John may have been influenced by a parallel in Roman legal practice: the book and seven seals correspond to the *familiae mancipatio* sealed by seven witnesses, the figure of Christ to the *familiae emptor* through whom inheritance was made possible.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

425. W. F. ALBRIGHT, "Return to Biblical Theology," *ChristCent* 75 (4, '58) 1328-31.

Thanks to modern research we can once again treat the Bible from beginning to end as an authentic document of religious history. The Bible itself stands in the center of history. The Dead Sea Scrolls have consolidated the historical unity of the Old and New Testaments. In the light of these same scrolls, there is no longer any concrete evidence for dating a single NT book after the seventies or eighties of the first century A.D. To meet today's problems we must return again to the Bible and draw new strength from the sources of Judaeo-Christian faith.—J. T. K.

426. R. BOHREN, "Heilsgeschichte und Predigt," *TheolZeit* 14 (1, '58) 38-45.

B summarizes and evaluates two recent studies on preaching, G. Wingren's *Die Predigt* and Ch. Maurer's *Evangelische Predigt heute*. Both authors recognize the troubling fact that preaching has become largely ineffectual and agree that preaching is part of *Heilsgeschichte*. For W the word of preaching is God's creative word and act. Because that word became flesh in Jesus Christ, who died and rose again, the foundation of all preaching is the death and Resurrection of Christ, into whom those who listen are incorporated. The preaching is the present phase of *Heilsgeschichte*, the period between the victory of Christ and His return. W considers *Heilsgeschichte* as a battle between God and Satan, and through the preaching the compelling power of Christ's victory spreads out to all peoples. When that power has reached the entire race, the parousia will come. Thus, the preaching hastens the time of the return of Christ.

Maurer's emphasis is on the victory of Christ. He asks whether the reason for the inefficiency of modern preaching may not be that it does not take that victory seriously enough. Because Christ has passed over the boundaries of death and darkness, and broken through the Gnostic division of men into

redeemed and unredeemed, not only the devout but all men belong to the people of God. The goal of preaching is given in Rom 11:11-36: it must extend to all men so that thereby Israel may be moved to jealousy and converted to Christ. Then will come the resurrection of dead and the complete establishment of the reign of God.

B thinks that both authors have done a valuable service, especially in their emphasis on the fact that preaching not only bears witness to *Heilsgeschichte*, but is part of it. But both have overlooked another fact: the preaching is intended not only for men, but also for "the Principalities and the Powers" (Eph 3:10), and even for God, in so far as it reminds Him of His past deeds and His promises, so that by fulfilling the latter, He may do still more wonderful things. Moreover, W has over-spiritualized the concept of preaching. If it is a continuation of God's creative word; if, as he says, victory over sickness and death resides in the word of Christ, why should preaching have only a spiritual effect? Why should it not also cure the sick? In the Gospels, preaching and healing are often mentioned together, and physical cures now would be visible signs that a salvific event (*Heilsgeschehen*) is taking place in the preaching. We know that they furnish no absolute proof of that; but ought not the absence of these "signs that followed" (Mk 16:20) be an indication that the reality which cannot be seen is also absent?

Any inquiry about the salvific reality of the preaching means an inquiry about the activity of the Holy Spirit. Preaching, faith and the gift of the Spirit are not necessarily present simultaneously (Acts 19:1-7). Christianity has the word; it has a kind of faith; but it cannot now say that the Spirit has fallen upon it. The dilemma of preaching is that the Spirit is now only weakly at work. When the Spirit is present, one necessarily proclaims the work which God is doing here and now. M sees the problem clearly when he demands that we ask, "Where is Jesus Christ at work today?" He tries to see the presence of Christ among the unchurched, among those who profess the religion of humanity, etc. Jesus is at work among the publicans and sinners with more power than we want to admit. M asks for preaching about the present activity of God. Only through a new outpouring of the spirit can the dilemma of preaching be removed.—M. B.

427. J. BOOZER, "A Biblical Understanding of Religious Experience," *Journ BibRel* 26 (4, '58) 291-297.

One ought not to overplay the rationality of biblical religious experience. The appearance of God to Moses in the bush is numinous and non-ethical, for here God is power. Isaiah's vision includes the numinous plus the moral; here power and goodness are mutually constitutive. The vision of Paul in Acts 9 is numinous, though the effect of the encounter is moral, for Paul experiences a power that is moral.

Otto postulated the uniqueness of religion on the non-rational aspect of the Holy, the numinous which coexists with the moral and the rational. This

numinous induces the feeling of creaturehood. Thus far Otto is an adequate interpreter of biblical visions, for he sees separately the awe-producing Holy and the rational-moral dimension of the Divine.—J. H. C.

428. R. E. BROWN, "The Pre-Christian Semitic Concept of 'Mystery,'" *Cath BibQuart* 20 (4, '58) 417-443.

The Semitic concept of "mystery" is found in the OT, the pseudepigrapha and Qumran literature. In the OT the most ancient concept is the prophet's introduction into the secret heavenly assembly where he heard God's plans. This developed in the postexilic books into a vision of the future revealed to man by God in figures. Sirach also calls the natural phenomena of the universe secrets, and teaches that a knowledge of God's secrets can be had by studying the ancient traditions. Wisdom is also familiar with the technical terminology of the mystery religions. In the pseudepigrapha Enoch speaks of mysteries illegitimately revealed, cosmic mysteries (moral meanings of sun, stars, etc.), God's plans for men, men's secret good and evil deeds, the mystery of final judgment, and the hidden Son of Man; 2 Baruch speaks of cosmic and eschatological mysteries; 4 Esdras tells of eschatological mysteries. The Qumran literature treats the mysteries of God's plans, especially eschatological ones; the sect's secret interpretations of the Torah; cosmic mysteries and mysteries of Belial, the opponent of God. This variety of meanings of "mystery" in the NT Semitic background should lead us to expect various meanings in the NT texts.—F. J. B.

429. A.-M. BRUNET, "La guerre dans la Bible," *LumVie* 7 (38, '58) 31-47.

The frequent experiences of Israel in wars led the OT writers to develop a theology of war itself. God's purposes in allowing war, they saw, were to provide a home for His people, to convert them to Him, to punish their unfaithfulness. The prophets spoke of a holy war, an eschatological combat that would cleanse the world, and after that the great peace of the Messianic era. The Christian attitude towards this background is reflected in Eph 2:14-18: peace has come in Christ, who destroyed the barrier between Jew and Gentile.—G. W. M.

430. F. A. BRUNNER, "Begotten of God," *AmEcclRev* 139 (5, '58) 317-330.

Man lives on two planes—the natural and the supernatural. Life on the supernatural level is a gift of God. Baptism is imperative, for through it man receives the beginnings of supernatural life; he becomes an adoptive son of God, thereby partaking, in some measure, of the life of God. Grace nourishes that life by healing the wounds of ignorance, malice, weakness and concupiscence and grows in accord with good works. Grace is indeed a present reality transforming man into one "begotten of God."—A. H. P.

431. S. CIPRIANI, "‘Dio e Cesare,’ Attualità di un problema alla luce del Nuovo Testamento," *DivThom* 61 (2-3, '58) 237-252.

O. Cullmann in *Dio e Cesare. Il problema dello stato nella Chiesa primitiva* (Italian trans., Milan, 1957) [cf. §§ 2-188r-191r] rightly maintains that the state is essentially provisional, but he goes against philosophy and revelation in believing that it is not essentially good. As a natural institution it is intrinsically good; NT texts confirm this: 1 Tim 2:1-4; Tit 3:1; 1 Pt 2:16-18; Jn 19:11. Rom 13:1-12 must be interpreted in the light of these texts. Paul does not grant absolute and unlimited powers to the state, nor does he depreciate it. In 1 Cor 6:1-11 the Apostle insists on mutual charity which overlooks injury and offence. In view of its provisional character, the citizens have the right and duty to criticize and even resist the state when it oversteps its own limits (Acts 5:29; 4:19; Dan 3:18). That the state, good in itself, may be turned into an instrument for evil is due to the men at its helm, not to the institution itself.—C. S.

432. F. COUREL, "Vivre dans le Seigneur," *Christus* 5 (20, '58) 512-524.

Man is not always able to pray to God quietly in his room. Nevertheless each of us can open the door of his senses to discover how things around us speak of God, how He made them for us and constantly performs in us His task of salvation. This type of prayer is not incompatible with what St. Ignatius calls *contemplatio ad amorem*. All the moments of our lives are a gift of God; the only thing we have to do is to offer them to Him. God is present in His creation; when we use creatures we come in contact with God, so to speak. Finally, God works in the universe the same way as man does; God works for man, and man works in order to become a true son of God here on earth and in life everlasting. "My Father works until now," says Christ, "and so do I." To work for God is to pray. In this way our daily work may become a true prayer, a supreme act of love.—M. R.

433. C. E. B. CRANFIELD, "Divine and Human Action. The Biblical Concept of Worship," *Interpretation* 12 (4, '58) 387-398.

Biblically, worship (meaning religious exercises, or the whole of life as God's service) is two actions. The primary Divine Action is the free, indispensable presence of God in OT worship and of Christ in Scripture, the sacraments and His brethren in Christian worship. Other elements are God's foreknowledge and calling, Christ's priesthood and the Holy Spirit's action. The secondary Human Action in Christian worship is basically hearing Christ present speaking to His Church as it stands. In response we accept His criticism, give praise and pray for all. Christian worship involves union of religious exercises with total self-offering, Church discipline and, fundamentally, obedience to Christ.—J. D. B.

434. J. C. DIDIER, "La formule du baptême et son histoire," *AmiCler* 68 (29, '58) 445-449.

If we consider the liturgy of baptism, we notice that the sacramental form could have varied from church to church in the course of the centuries. Theologians as well as the Church's Magisterium have accepted this principle, starting from certain historical facts and within certain limits. It does not seem, however, that the formulas of the NT, either Christological or Trinitarian, are to be considered as baptismal "forms" properly so called, but as condensed expressions of the Christian faith in which the sacrament is received. Unanimously in all the churches and from the period before the end of the apostolic age, baptismal professions of faith were made in a Trinitarian form. If these professions originally took on a purely Christological form, it was only during a very brief period at the beginning. But we must observe, on the one hand, that the Christological formulation breathes an authentic Trinitarian faith and, on the other hand, that the Trinitarian formulation of the apostolic age does not suppose the analysis and development of later centuries but expresses only the gospel data.—P. L.

435. G. EBELING, "Jesus und Glaube," *ZeitTheolKirche* 55 (1, '58) 64-110.

Jesus is not only the object of faith but the very source and ground of it. And faith, in turn, is the very essence of the work of Jesus, not a means to an end. (1) While some usages of *pistis* and *pisteuein* have no immediate religious reference, the fulfillment of this faith always presupposes God. (2) We have very little explicit reference to Jesus' own faith, but find, rather, Jesus attempting to awaken faith in others. (3) Faith is not a partial function, but concerns and undergirds the totality of existence: for faith is *a*) the certainty of existence, *b*) directed toward the future, *c*) a participation in the limitless power of God, *d*) carried out in contact with others, *e*) made concrete in specific situations and *f*) always salvation-faith, in fact, salvation itself.—C. E. F.

436. M. FERNÁNDEZ JIMÉNEZ, "Naturaleza del conocimiento de los Apóstoles acerca del depósito de la Revelación," *RevEspTeol* 18 (1, '58) 3-33.

The vast majority of Catholic theologians not only reject any form of objective dogmatic progress since the end of the apostolic age, but also deny the possibility that the later Church could more fully understand the deposit of revelation than did the apostles. This second affirmation, however, is far from being unshakeably proved. (1) As for the origin of the theory, the agreement of the 16th- and 17-century scholastics (and hence of present-day manuals of theology) derives from several texts of St. Thomas' *Summa* (cf. 2-2, q. 1, a. 7). It seems, however, that Thomas is not speaking in these places of the impossibility of a better understanding of the *depositum*, but is only excluding the possibility of new public revelations in the post-apostolic Church. (2) The argument from Scripture is also far from conclusive. Eph 1:7-10 (like 2 Cor 3:18) refers to all the faithful and in it the words "wisdom"

and "prudence" describe attributes of God, not of the apostles. In Eph 3:3-5 we are dealing only with a particular truth; besides, the word "generations" refers exclusively to past generations. 1 Cor 2:7-8, Lk 24:45-46 and the widely adduced text of Rom 8:23 cannot by themselves be extended to exclude even the possibility of a fuller understanding of revelation on the part of the Church under the guidance of the Spirit. Eph 2:19-20 proves only that the whole Catholic doctrine must be based upon and be in accord with the apostolic teaching. The promise of the teaching Spirit, included in Jn 14:15-17, is made not only to the apostles but also to their successors *forever*. A careful examination of Jn 14:25-26 would rather seem to favor the contrary theory inasmuch as it states that the doctrine of Christ will be revealed to the apostles "in its entirety" (*panta*), but it does not say "in its fullest sense" (*panteleōs*). And the same consideration applies to Jn 16:12-13. (3) The argument from tradition is also weak because few Fathers can be adduced and their words are often taken from contexts different from the one being discussed here. (4) The theological argument, finally, based on the fact that the apostles were constituted by Christ public teachers and authorized witnesses, does not exclude for the Church the possibility of a further penetration of the truths taught by them, unless we take an *a priori* concept of teacher.

The apostles could, therefore, have been ignorant of some truths connected with the *depositum*, as, e.g., the ones which are the conclusion of an analytic or explicative syllogism whose major premise is a revealed article known to them and whose minor is a natural truth belonging to subsequent and more perfect cultures.—L. I. R.

437. R. GINNS, "Our Lady in the Scriptures," *LifeSpir* 13 (146-147, '58) 105-115.

A brief defense of Catholic views on scriptural texts regarding the Blessed Virgin.

438. R. W. GLEASON, "Law and Love," *AmEcclRev* 139 (3, '58) 176-183.

The Christian vocation summons to a continuous, limitless, radical return of love to Him who has loved us first. Too many Christians live on a pre-Christian level of thought, conceiving their relation to God in terms of impersonal law. St. John teaches, however, that God is Love. God's law is both an expression of His love for us and a clear plan for a return of love. St. Paul makes clear the nature of this new law: the NT does not substitute one code for another; it gives in place of law an interior principle of life, sanctifying grace, which makes us capable of responding to God's love for us. Whatever fosters this interior life of love is commanded or counselled; whatever destroys it is forbidden. This interior principle of love does free the Christian from exterior law, but it also engenders in him a restlessness without anguish which flows from the demand for complete self-surrender.—J. F. Br.

439. P. DE HAES, "Doctrina de labore humano in Novo Testamento," *Coll Mech* 43 (5, '58) 497-500.

The OT mentions two aspects of work: (1) its fundamental dignity, and (2) the fact that toil is a result of sin. The NT adds a third: work now has a redemptive meaning because of its connection with the redemptive work of Christ, a connection achieved by fraternal charity.—A. H. P.

440. W. K. HARRISON, "The Time of the Rapture as Indicated in Certain Scriptures," *BibSac* 114 (456, '57) 316-325; 115 (457, '58) 20-26; (458, '58) 109-119; (459, '58) 201-211.

An examination of 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Mt 24 and Revelation shows that the rapture and resurrection of the NT Church (*cf.* 1 Thes 4:13-18) precede the great tribulation, the apostasy and the arrival of the man of sin.

441. G. JOHNSTON, "The Servant Image in the New Testament," *TheolToday* 15 (3, '58) 321-333.

The Servant image, never acclimated in Gentile Christianity, signified Jesus as the fulfillment of Isaianic prophecy and the embodiment of love, manifest through sacrifice. It is probable that Jesus taught that He would be put to death after an initial period of exhilarating hope. Though there are casual references to a suffering Messiah prior to Jesus, Jesus Himself probably made the Son of Man-Suffering Messiah equation. The Servant is teacher, intercessor and savior. The Servant image was primarily for the inner circle. The interpreted Servant image provides an ideal of ministry, an ideal of mission, an ideal symbol of the sacrificial offering of Jesus, an ideal symbol of the Church's working to offer reconciliation, and lastly an ideal of the life in heaven of service through love.—J. H. C.

442. R. LENNOX, "The Servant of Yahweh in the Old Testament," *TheolToday* 15 (3, '58) 315-320.

"Servant" is used in the secular sense of "worker" and in the religious sense of "pious." In the Servant Songs the Servant is used in a special sense to denote at one and the same time the whole people, the remnant and the One. The Servant's death is a guilt offering, effective in bringing all men to repentance and forgiveness.—J. H. C.

443. A. LEFÈVRE, "Péché et pénitence dans la Bible," *MaisDieu* 55 ('58) 7-22.

The later OT prophets present sin and repentance according to two distinct schemes, that of infidelity and return, represented by the prophets of the Alliance, and that of offense and judgment, developed by Isaiah and his followers. It is the second which dominates in the NT, without, however, excluding the first. In the NT repentance appears as: (1) the first object of preaching, closely linked with the coming of the Kingdom; (2) a confession of faith—to do penance is identically to believe the "good news"; (3) an efficacious sign of

the judgment of the Spirit in the Church and an anticipation of final judgment; (4) the sacrament of fraternal correction in the Christian community; (5) the sacrament which reopens the shut door of the sanctuary and readmits the sinner to the Christian Banquet.—F. P. G.

444. J. L. LEUBA, "Der Zusammenhang zwischen Geist und Tradition nach dem Neuen Testament," *KerDogma* 4 (4, '58) 234-250.

A comprehensive view of the NT doctrine on the Holy Spirit must consider the historical development of the very concept. Recent research has led to the conclusion that there was a definite distinction between what the Spirit was conceived to be before and after the Resurrection. Before the Resurrection the *pneuma* bore an eschatological signification and was usually taken in the OT sense. After the Resurrection the main developments of the theory of the work of the Spirit were: (1) there is no difference between the activity of the glorified Christ and of the Holy Spirit (Paul, Mark, Matthew); (2) tradition and Spirit must be considered apart from one another, but both as a special form of the divine work of Christ (Luke); (3) an attempt is made to formulate the intimate relationship between the distinct existence of Spirit and tradition (John). Our own doctrine today must encompass the sum of this development. Our conception of tradition must include not only the *matter* transmitted, but also the *manner* of transmission. In trying to determine the connection between the work of the Holy Spirit and the evangelical-apostolic tradition and vice versa, the closest sort of a synthesis at which we can arrive is a polarization in which we are aware of a dynamic movement and reciprocal need. Only through the Holy Spirit can the message of the NT be made actual and operative; only because of the message of the NT can the Church know the working of the Holy Spirit.—R. P. B.

445. S. LYONNET, "De notione redemptionis," *VerbDom* 36 (3, '58) 129-146.

The word "redemption" is derived from *redemptio*, the Latin equivalent of the Greek *apolytrōsis*, which is formed from the substantive *lytron*, which in turn is from the verb *lyō* ("to free"). *Lytron* means "that by which someone is freed"; often in profane Greek this is a ransom-price, but not always. When the NT says that Christ's death is our *lytron*, it means "that by which we are freed from the servitude of sin"; it does not mean that Christ's death was a price—paid either to the devil (Origen, Ambrose) or to God the Father (Peter Lombard, the Paschal Preface). In the LXX *lytron* and cognate words are used as technical terms for the "redemption" by which God liberated His chosen people from the Egyptian bondage—without any payment to the Pharaoh, of course. These technical terms were taken over by the NT to indicate that when Christ by His death, an act of supreme love (*cf.* Mk 10:45; 1 Tim 2:6 with Gal 2:20; Eph 5:2; 5:25), liberated us from the bondage of sin, He was fulfilling an OT type.—J. F. Bl.

446. W. PANNENBERG, "Christlicher Glaube und menschliche Freiheit," *Ker Dogma* 4 (4, '58) 251-280.

After a brief treatment of the scriptural loci the author discusses the problem from a theological standpoint.

447. R. RUSSELL, "Modern Exegesis and the Fact of the Resurrection," *Down Rev* 76 (245, '58) 251-264.

The form-critical assertion that the Christian community totally reshaped Christ and His message errs in ignoring (1) that community's leadership by actual witnesses to Christ, (2) its scrupulousness for accuracy of report about the Lord, and (3) its very humanity and diversity which would demand that its teachers should in varying circumstances emphasize varying elements of a nevertheless basically fixed doctrine. Thus Levie and Benoit note that modern exegetes will best consider the Resurrection amid the whole Christian synthesis, and especially in its role at the center of the primitive kerygma throughout Acts and the Epistles. The texts assembled from these books by J. Schmitt, in *Jésus ressuscité dans la prédication apostolique*, suggest in the apostolic preaching a Christology deliberately conformed to the Pentecostal instruction and focused theologically on the Resurrection. Paul too (expressly in 1 Cor 15:1; elsewhere through obvious employment of stereotyped formulas) acknowledges himself to be merely communicating an apostolic creed, that invariably is fundamentally paschal. In fine, form-criticism, as seemingly at least willing to allow for argument's sake the possibility and the meaning of the Resurrection (not to do so would, indeed, foredoom all inquiry), should be impressed by the manner in which the early centrality of the Resurrection doctrine and the real fact of Christianity coincide into a forceful historical guarantee of the truth of Easter morning.—J. C. O'B.

448. L. SCHEFFCZYK, "Biblische und dogmatische Theologie," *TrierTheolZeit* 67 (4, '58) 193-209.

Today there is much discussion about the nature and limits of biblical and dogmatic theology and about the means of bringing the two disciplines into harmony. Some exegetes have constructed a biblical theology which they claim is independent of dogma, while others make the distinction that biblical theology is historical and dogmatic theology is a synthesis. This distinction cannot be maintained, since biblical theology also has its own synthesis, and history forms a large part of dogmatic theology.

The problem may be stated thus: are there two independent theologies? First we must realize the uniqueness and limits of biblical theology. Its material object is the early documents of the Church, and its formal object is God giving witness in the written word which effects salvation. Yet an essential limitation of biblical theology is the fact that God is speaking to man in human words. Now while Scripture contains all revelation, nevertheless this completeness is not explicit and can be made so only by the inspiration of the Church

under the guidance of the Spirit. For that reason dogmatic theology must come to the aid of biblical theology, because the final word is given by that discipline which proceeds from Scriptural truth unfolded in the active tradition of the Church. Thus one may say that dogmas are the natural high point in the development of consciousness of belief, and from them as a vantage point one can have the best view forwards as well as backwards. Furthermore, dogmatic theology translates the content of faith into the language of philosophical concepts.

Therefore both theologies should work together. Biblical theology furnishes information, stimulus and influence to dogmatic theology, which in turn should consider biblical theology in its entire extent and not look upon it merely as a storehouse of proof texts. On the other hand the exegete should realize that tradition, known through dogmatic theology, gives a further development to a biblical text. Once the Scripture scholar admits the principle of dogmatic development, he cannot object to the possibility of a legitimate evolution in the meaning of a text, even though this sense is not yet proved exegetically. Finally, biblical theology with its factual work lays the groundwork for faith (the horizontal dimension), while dogmatic theology, aided by tradition and the insight of enlightening faith, builds upon this foundation (the vertical dimension).—J. J. C.

449. E. E. SCHNEIDER, "Die Bedeutung der Begriffe Raum, Zeit und Ewigkeit in der christlichen Verkündigung und Lehre," *KerDogma* 4 (4, '58) 281-286.

Traditional theology has taught many of its concepts in the universalizing terms of Greek philosophy. But the Christian preacher and teacher must seek out the biblical, non-philosophical meaning of such terms as space, time and eternity. Passages such as Acts 17:24-28 show that space and time for us are the concrete here and now of personal encounter with God, of actual worship, of sacramental confrontation in preaching, baptism and the Lord's Supper. And this sacramental *hic et nunc* is also, as Jn 17:3 indicates, a *nunc aeternum*. Biblical eternity is not timeless, but is an eternal time; the eternity of God embraces the reality of all time.—G. W. M.

450. J. B. SOUCEK, "Pilgrims and Sojourners. An Essay in Biblical Theology," *CommViat* 1 (1, '58) 3-17.

The image of human life as a road or pilgrimage runs through the entire Bible. (1) In the OT we first meet it as a curse inflicted upon Cain. Even the initial call of Abraham suggests that his wanderings are but a provisional state of life, but the remainder of OT history shows clearly that the state of being a wanderer or sojourner in the world is a fixed part of Israel's existence (*cf.*, e.g., 1 Chr 29:15). Other motifs of wandering found in the OT are the life in the desert during the Exodus, the manner of the settlement of Canaan and the contrast drawn between the mobility of the Tabernacle and the

permanence of the Temple. These are also symbols of the resilience of the OT faith in its hostile world; sojourning means willingness to abandon the goods of the world at Yahweh's behest.

(2) In the NT we encounter both John the Baptist and Jesus sojourning in the wilderness. But a clearer idea of the meaning of being a wayfarer appears in the notion of following Christ as it is detailed in the call of the disciples and in the sending out of the seventy-two. Sojourning with Jesus "is a freedom *from* narrow ties and *for* a life in a new community of the children of God both in this time and in the life eternal." St. Paul's best expression of Christian sojourning is in the protracted metaphor of the race in Phil 3:12-16 and elsewhere. In 1 Peter (as in James) the exiles of the dispersion, to whom the letter is addressed, are all Christians living as pilgrims between the poles of eschatology which are the Resurrection and the Second Coming. This life is marked by faith, moral reform and love, and by an attitude of confidence toward the world. Finally, the Epistle to the Hebrews in two important sections (3:7—4:16 and 10:19 to the end) sets forth Christian life as a pilgrimage in the eschatological interim that demands hopeful, obedient and responsive participation.—G. W. M.

451. C. SPICQ, "Priestly Virtues in the New Testament," *Scripture* 10 (9, '58) 10-17; (11, '58) 84-93.

I. The Discourse after the Last Supper (Jn 13-18) elaborates upon three of the key virtues of the apostle-priest. (1) The first and fundamental one of these is faith. After the special efforts of Jesus to instruct the apostles, He exclaims: "At last you have come to believe!" (Jn 16:31; cf. 17:6-8). The apostles' task is now to make known Christ to others from the solidity of their own faith. (2) The triumph of Christ's conquest of the world (16:33) and the promises of Christ (14:12 ff.; 16:23 ff.; etc.) are the foundation of the priest's hope. (3) The nature and necessity of the virtue of charity is expressed in the Parable of the Vine (15:1-10) and summed up in Christ's command: "Abide in my love." The priest's charity must consist in a special attachment to the person of Christ, from which springs priestly zeal for souls and such humble and loving service of them as Christ exhibited in washing the disciples' feet (13:1-17).—G. W. M.

II. The Epistle to the Hebrews singles out two virtues proper to the priest of the New Covenant: compassion and fidelity. Heb 2:10-16: Our High Priest not only suffered for us but like us; sharing the same ordeals makes one compassionate and devoted to companions in misfortune. So important a subject is this to Hebrews that the author returns to it in 4:14—5:10. The High Priest of the New Covenant shows outstanding faithfulness both in His intercession before God and in His devotedness to men (3:2-6). His priests will be expected to imitate His fidelity.

The grace of the priesthood is sufficient for the needs of both the pastoral life and the personal life of the priest (2 Tim 1:6). The inspiration of

the priest's ministry is charity (1 Tim 6:11; 2 Tim 2:22). Prudence is clearly indispensable and helps to control the exercise of authority (1 Tim 1:7). The purity of the priest's life is bound up with the good name of the Church. It is a religious consecration without defilement (1 Tim 1:17). Preaching the word is the promulgation of salvation for which priests have received the Spirit of Truth (Jn 15:26; 1 Tim 3:16).—J. A. R.

452. L. W. SPITZ, "The Freedom We Have in Christ," *ConcTheolMon* 29 (11, '58) 801-811.

Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. He is true God and true son of the Virgin, anointed by God as our Prophet, Priest, and King. In Him we have our freedom, freedom from the bondage of sin; this was obtained for us by the obedience of Jesus, climactically shown in His Passion. All His suffering was active because assumed voluntarily; all His activity was a suffering in so far as it was an assumed burden. This freedom we have in faith. It is exhibited and communicated through the means of grace, which are administered by Christ's disciples.—J. O'R.

453. H. S. TIGNER, "The Perspective of Victory. The Problem of Human Suffering in the Old and New Testaments," *Interpretation* 12 (4, '58) 399-406.

The Hebrews did not have a satisfactory answer to the problem of the apparent prosperity of the wicked and the hardships of the just. Their anguish at being unable to account for the apparent injustice was best expressed in Job and in Ps 44. In spite of this, however, the Hebrews maintained the conviction—and this was one of their greatest religious intuitions—that God would see to it that somehow justice would triumph. How exactly God would achieve His purpose, it was not for puny man to ask. The more so, since sinful man deserves some suffering which often enough has an ennobling and instructive effect.

In the NT attitude towards suffering a striking development is evident: "It is now taken for granted that there is no way from man's present situation to the Kingdom of God, except through a valley of suffering and a field of trial." The OT intuitions are given a new dimension through the belief in a resurrection shared with Christ, so that in the midst of suffering the Christian can rejoice.—F. C.

454. T. F. TORRANCE, "Aspects of Baptism in the New Testament," *TheolZeit* 14 (4, '58) 241-260.

The four Evangelists, who all mention John's baptism, speak of this baptism into repentance only in the context of its Christian transformation in Jesus' own submission to it. The Baptist supplied the Church with its ritual act, but the doctrine of baptism is determined exclusively by the event of Christ's Baptism and by all that it involved for Him on our behalf. The rite, moreover,

was modified by the event: as Jesus went into the water, the Spirit descended upon Him—whence the double form in Christian baptism, baptism in water from below and baptism in heavenly water (*mayim, shamayim*) from above. This twofold character was reinforced at Pentecost. But also the doctrine is expounded after the pattern of the rite. In the NT, the language of descent and ascent was applied to the doctrine of Christ, not only for His death and Resurrection, but also, and more fundamentally, for His Incarnation and Ascension. *Baptisma*, like *kērygma*, must be taken objectively as referring to the mighty acts of God in Christ that are proclaimed in the word and sacrament. *Baptisma* directs immediate attention, not to the rite, but to the objective and fulfilled reality in Christ. Christ's personal Baptism must be regarded as a consecration to His mission as Suffering Servant, culminating in His death. The great "baptismatic event" includes the once and for all Baptism of Blood on the cross and, by way of subjective counterpart, the once and for all Baptism of the Spirit upon the Church at Pentecost.

Baptism is not into the name of Christ, but into the name of the Trinity. The baptismatic event includes always the relation of the Father to the Son through the Spirit, the act of the Father in sending the Son in connection with the work of the Spirit. Baptism refers to the whole incarnational event, from Christ's birth, through all His life of obedient self-oblation, to His Ascension. If it is spoken of as the sacrament of our incorporation into Christ, it is ultimately grounded on the fact that in Jesus the Son incorporated Himself into our humanity. Our participation in this baptismatic event involves a sharing in Christ's miraculous birth, as well as in His death and Resurrection and reaches to the final parousia. The sacramental seal becomes the 'seal of union with Christ and of communion with the Father through union with Christ, in whom there was offered to the Father a human response to God's Covenant faithfulness. The form this union takes is the Church, the Body of Christ. To this Church, Christ gave the ordinance of baptism to be administered as the sacrament of His fulfilled work.—R. L. R.

455. T. F. TORRANCE, "Consecration and Ordination," *ScotJournTheol* 11 (3, '58) 225-252.

The OT rites of consecration and ordination were fulfilled in Christ and abrogated, but the NT uses OT language and adapts OT rites, giving them new significance. The OT consecration of priest, king and prophet involved anointing, but the distinctive term in the OT for consecration or ordination is "filling the hands," which describes both the act of consecration and its completion in the sacrificial meal. The NT shows all these rites fulfilled in Christ, the institutional priesthood of Aaron being replaced by the restored priesthood of sonship in Christ through the consecration of baptism. Within this consecration of the whole body, there is also a special consecration of the apostles and the apostolic ordination of others through the laying on of hands and prayer. This latter rite was taken over directly from the OT

(Levites, Joshua). It was essentially a lay rite, a commissioning of ministers of the word, accompanied by charisma, performed in prayer, and especially related to the Lord's Supper. Doctrinally, the source and principal agent of ordination is Christ Himself, but in it the whole Church concurs, the ordained ministers acting as servants of Christ. The end of ordination is the ministry of word and sacraments.—F. P. G.

456. T. F. TORRANCE, "What is the Church?" *EcumRev* 11 (1, '58) 6-21.

Among the many NT images of the Church, that of the Body of Christ is the most important because it provides us with direct reference to Christ Himself, who is the essence of the Church. Two basic observations about this image can be made. (1) Christ is the Church because He took upon Himself humanity and gathered men together in Him. (2) The Church participates in Christ, deriving its life from Him. *a)* In its vertical dimension, the Church is union with Christ, and that is the primary meaning of *koinōnia*. Just as the divine and human natures are united hypostatically in Christ, so Christ and the Church are personally united. This does not mean that the Church is perfect: it is both justified in Christ and in need of constant purification by baptism and Holy Communion. In its different aspects the Church is the Body of the crucified, risen, ascended and advent Christ. *b)* In its horizontal dimension, the Church is communion and fellowship in Christ with the Church Militant and the Church Triumphant; hence the secondary meaning of *koinōnia*. Under this aspect the Church is a communion of love, a fellowship of reconciliation and a community sharing in the new creation to be revealed when Christ comes again.—G. W. M.

457. P. VOULET, "La contemplation évangélique," *Christus* 5 (20, '58) 558-576.

The Ignatian contemplation of the Gospels is a particular brand of contemplation wherein we are asked to penetrate the mystery by gazing at a scene, by hearing the words in order to initiate a conscious reflection. In this way we try to reach Jesus Christ, well engaged in the task of our salvation in which we must collaborate. The event of the day becomes eternal because the Incarnate Word is eternal. Every mystery includes two aspects of the reality: it is social and personal. Each of us must die with Christ if he would share in the reward. This personal activity must be governed by a true faith accompanied by a genuine effort of the intellect which the Holy Spirit transforms into a gift of wisdom every time we contemplate the life of Christ; we are interiorly transformed because a true contact has been established between our soul and God through the medium of Christ's humanity.—M. R.

458. J. D. W. WATTS, "Elements of Old Testament Worship," *JournBibRel* 26 (3, '58) 217-221.

Ancient Hebrews thought of worship purely as ritual or cult. The classical act of worship was sacrifice in three forms: the communal meal, the whole

burnt offering and an offering releasing life power through the sprinkling of blood. Dramatic ritual emphasized the presence of God and His reigning Lordship, His saving acts in the Exodus and at Sinai and in His creation. Worship involved direct utterances of God to the people, namely, apodictic law and prophetic oracle.—J. H. C.

Christology

459. J. ALFARO, "Cristo Glorioso, Revelador del Padre," *Gregorianum* 39 (2, '58) 222-270.

The Gospel of John evidences at every stage the role of Christ as revealer of the Father. In the Prologue in particular the visible glory of Christ (v. 14) reveals the invisible glory of the Father (v. 18). Throughout the Gospel, the miraculous power, the authority to teach and the personal faith commanded by Christ are all rooted in the Father. The most explicit statements of all, however, are found in Jn 17. Here the revelation takes place on three planes: *a*) in his earthly life Christ has revealed the Father; *b*) throughout their earthly life Christ will continue this revelation to men and keep them united to the Father in Himself; *c*) the faithful will participate with Christ in an eschatological glorification. Comparisons of Jn 1:14 with 17:24 and of 1:18 with 17:26 show that Christ's earthly and glorious life is an anticipation and consummation of the revelation of His own glory and of the glory of the Father. The glorious Christ will continue eternally His role of revealer.

What is the theological explanation of this Johannine doctrine? On the ontological level, the humanity of Christ is intrinsically actuated by a substantial determination which relates it to the subsistence of the divine Word, which in turn is the subsistent relation resulting from the eternal generation of the Father. On the psychological level, Christ's human consciousness of Himself is a consciousness of the subsistence of the Person of the Word in Him. The vision of the Word necessarily involves the relationship of the Trinity, and thus revelation of the Father is connatural to Christ in His every human act. By His Resurrection Christ conquers suffering and death and thus becomes the perfect revealer of the Father. Since the resurrection of men is a participation in the glory of Christ's Resurrection, human beatitude will involve perfect vision of the Word in Christ. Christ's eternal role as revealer will be to dispose risen men for the vision of the Trinity.—G. W. M.

460. R. P. CASEY, "The Earliest Christologies," *JournTheolStud* 9 (2, '58) 253-277.

A satisfactory reconstruction of what has been called the most primitive Christology of all cannot be had. The clues to what Jesus thought of Himself, which would comprise the most primitive Christology, are tantalizingly meager. (1) From Mark's account of the Baptism and from Q's report of the Temptation, it is clear that Jesus believed Himself possessed by the Spirit and bound

to act under the Spirit's direction. (2) From the Temptation narrative it is evident that He was no miracle-monger and had no intention of pursuing secular aims. (3) From Mark's version of the incident at Caesarea Philippi it is plain that Jesus was not concerned with political hopes, nor with identifying Himself with apocalyptic figures. (4) From the pronouncement at the Last Supper, one must conclude that He looked on His approaching death as sacrificial in some sense, and part of a divine economy. (5) From the prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane it can be seen that He did not relish suffering for its own sake, but that God's will must be accepted. (6) The implications of the cry from the cross are that He yielded as a man to anguish and despair. This fragmentary insight into Jesus' thought about Himself provides a measure of His stature and of the originality of His sense of vocation, but not a systematic Christology. Within the Apostolic College opinions about Jesus differed. He was a prophet, the Son of Man, the Messiah. These notions represented accommodations of Jewish ideas to current realities and hopes. Gentile Christianity extended the earlier Jewish concepts. Jesus was the lord of a new cult, the fullness of the Godhead in bodily form, the form of God humbling Himself to human dimensions, the ultimate expression of God's nature and purpose.—F. P. S.

461. W. A. VAN ROO, "The Resurrection of Christ: Instrumental Cause of Grace," *Gregorianum* 39 (2, '58) 271-284.

"The resurrection of Christ, both as an event in history, and in its permanent effects in the glorious humanity of the risen Christ, is an instrumental cause of our justification and of our future glory." According to the theory of instrumentality advanced here, the humanity of Christ and the mysteries accomplished in it are the instruments by which God chooses to give grace. They belong to the class of instruments called "efficacious signs" of the divine will, not to that of "instruments of art." As the consummation of the mystery of redemption in Christ, the Resurrection, by a type of appropriation, is the efficient instrumental cause of our newness of life and future glory.—G. W. M.

462. A. M. WARD, "The Authority of Jesus Christ," *LondQuartHolRev* 27 (4, '58) 247-251.

Christian acceptance of the absolute authority of Jesus Christ should be supported by an effort to understand the nature of the authority behind Jesus' teaching. The uniqueness of His authority is rooted in the oneness of the Teacher with the Father. Unlike the Scribes, Jesus never uses His authority to intimidate, but by persuasion appeals to the likeness of God within men. For many Christians there is a problem in knowing how to apply Jesus' authority in their own situations. To make Christ the source of all authority today is to accept, as St. Paul and the early Christians did, the person of Christ, which is what the Gospels hand on to us. Full acceptance of this authority is the source of true Christian freedom.—G. W. M.

463. J. H. WRIGHT, "The Consummation of the Universe in Christ," *Gregorianum* 39 (2, '58) 285-294.

Because Christ has dominion over all creation, His work of redemption involves bringing all things to their consummation. According to St. Paul this activity involves two stages: (1) In the present stage (*cf.* 1 Cor 15:25) Christ reigns over all as Head of the Church, His Body. (2) In the second stage, "the end" (*cf.* 1 Cor 15:24), Christ will come again to hand over His universal kingdom to the Father. In the judgment He will assign each one his place in the universe and transform the material universe into new heavens and new earth. The human nature of Christ serves as the instrument of the divine intellect and will in effecting this consummation.—G. W. M.

Myth and Symbol

464. R. E. CUSHMAN, "Is the Incarnation a Symbol?" *TheolToday* 15 (2, '58) 167-182.

C analyzes Bultmann's aversion to regarding the Incarnation as a datable objective reality as due to (1) his critical methodology inherited from Wrede, Bousset and Herrmann and (2) his theological and philosophical basis derived from Kant and existentialism, the latter bias misleading because relatively unacknowledged by B himself. According to B the Christ-event is removed from the world of *Historie* and given a place only in *Geschichte*, the inner history of man. As a result, Christianity turns out to be a "cruciform interpretation of essential human existence existentially appropriated," a transaction between God and the believer made possible by the I-Thou dimension, a distinctive and, withal, exciting philosophy of religion (as for Schleiermacher), but not the historic faith rooted in Jesus-Christ.

C advocates the rejection of the Kantian dualism between nature and spirit, a repudiation of B's tendency to retreat from the world of history into the realm of *Geschichte* and a reaffirmation of the Incarnation as an "act of God" occurring in God's own world, with God as sovereign "over nature and history as well as over spirituality."—C. E. F.

465. I. HISLOP, "Myth, History and Revelation. Bultmann and Demythologization," *Blackfriars* 29 (463, '58) 402-412.

Latent in Bultmann's work are some assumptions deserving analysis. Bultmann seems bent on compounding the existence of subjective, mystical or apocalyptic vision with a relativist point of view towards all phenomena. He distrusts the objective genuinity of history because, since data are meaningless until analyzed, history's meaningfulness is directly proportional to its subjectivity, to its significance for this man now. But Christ and the primitive community before its disillusionment he first considers as a moment outside history, beyond involvement with men and institutions, where individual engagement with God was freely accepted. This encounter was based on

knowledge of God as the personal principle of the world frustration that even we experience. Belief, however, is not argued to nor historically justified; it is itself existential, its certitude that of personal (usually bitter) experience. So man today, like the frustrated Christ of yesterday, can be freed from the death of limitation by meeting God as the limiter. Secondly, spirit, new nature, sacraments and the like all fall aside as of no present significance; the historical events and, logically, even the person of Christ are at least irrelevant; what matters in the NT is the testimony to the eschatological or existential event/moment wherein God may be met and authentic life be had. To Bultmann, Christian belief is essentially beyond proof, utterly different in reality from any definition of it; bearing on a subject unknown apart from it, it is its own sole valid authentication. Thus the Gospels, all relative and mythological, are yet an occasion whereby one is introduced to an altogether different and singularly real order.—J. C. O'B.

466. R. MARLÉ, "Théologie protestante: Bultmann prédicateur et philosophe d'après ses derniers écrits," *RechSciRel* 46 (3, '58) 421-430.

For Bultmann preaching is a sacred mission. The constantly recurring theme of his sermons is man's profound yearning for God who is obtainable through the Christ alone. B's kerygmatic approach and idealism, however, are not well adapted to the educational and pastoral requirements of a sermon. As a philosopher of history, B is mainly concerned with the historicity of man shown in his free decisions to accept God—an acceptance which need not be supported by grace. B's theology cannot solve man's deepest problems nor can it render man beneficiary of the riches of the Faith.—A. H. P.

467. G. VAHANIAN, "Biblical Symbolism and Man's Religious Quest," *JournRel* 38 (4, '58) 226-239.

A symbol is something that, first, points beyond itself and, second, points to the contingent congruence, existentially speaking, between the subject or subjects and the object of a particular experience, or between the word and the thing, the finite and the infinite, etc. Any symbol, especially a theological symbol, always operates against the background of a natural phenomenon.

In the light of biblical myth, an examination of man's quest and its relation to symbolism brings forward the argument that biblical myth consists in (1) a constant confrontation of man's existential historicity with the Wholly Other's transcendence; (2) a rejection of orthodox otherworldliness; and (3) a rejection of liberal Christianity. The drive toward symbolism can be stifled by orthodoxy or inflated and made turgid by mythology; it remains a permanent trait of mankind, and its function cannot effectively be dismissed by him who seeks who he is. In terms of religious reality, symbolism is the only way that the "infinite and transphenomenal" can be communicated. The function of the symbol consists in deciphering the deeper meaning of the present and the actual and not in sublimating it. The symbol achieves this end

by penetrating the framework of day-to-day reality and gives it the atmosphere of a prodigal's return.

The Reformation had recovered for western culture, not without delineating the limits of its power, the ultimate meaning of the symbol in the sense of a redintegration of the created. But the ironic tragedy of the Protestant era has been that it soon forgot what dynamic truth it had revealed to the artist.—S. B. M.

The Resurrection of the Dead

468. L. CIAPPI, "La risurrezione dei morti secondo la dottrina cattolica," *Gregorianum* 39 (2, '58) 203-221.

A dogmatic study of the NT data on the resurrection of the dead.

469. S. GAROFALO, "Sulla 'escatologia intermedia' in S. Paolo," *Gregorianum* 39 (2, '58) 335-352.

In this review article of O. Cullmann's *Immortalité de l'âme ou Résurrection des morts?* (1956) [cf. § 2-192r-193r], S after a detailed analysis of C's position insists that the two crucial texts, Phil 1:21-23 and 2 Cor 5:1-10, imply the immortality of the soul. By his rejection of any "speculation" on the part of Paul, C seems to deny all legitimate philosophical or theological clarification of a text. Furthermore, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is found in Wis 3:1-9 and in Jewish writings shortly before or after the NT times, and both the Parable of Dives and Lazarus (Lk 16:25) and the promise to the good thief (Lk 23:43) suppose this doctrine. Finally, the "either-or" choice constitutes the basic fallacy of C's book, since the NT affirms both the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body.—J. J. C.

470. J. J. HELLER, "The Resurrection of Man," *TheolToday* 15 (2, '58) 217-229.

The doctrine of the resurrection from the dead, always a difficult one, is now in danger of suffering a fate even worse than skepticism, that of being ignored. H attempts to re-examine the biblical basis of this doctrine in the light of latest scholarship and relate it to modern scientific inquiry in three areas. (1) *The totality of the individual*. In the Bible as in modern science, soul and body are not separate. Man is an indivisible whole, and *body*, *soul*, *spirit* and *heart* express relationships, not parts. The resurrection means not the reuniting of a disembodied soul with its resurrected body, but rather "the restoration of the whole man to the fullness of personal life." It is, indeed, not just the "resurrection of the body," but of the whole man. (2) *The given status of life*. In the Bible as in modern science, man is mortal. In most of the OT death is the end. When the concept of life after death does emerge, it is not a belief in the immortal character of man, but that God will raise up man and restore him to full personal life. Resurrection will be a condition of life *given* to man by God and not the result of any self-sustaining natural capacity of the

soul. (3) *The solidarity of the community*. In the Bible man never exists in isolation, but always as a member of one or more collectivities. So in the NT, resurrection at the last day "will be a corporate experience of the new humanity redeemed in Christ," "not each individual in separate existence, but rather the Body of Christ, the Church."

The biblical witness thus understood may effect a certain easing of the tension in the conflict of the Christian and "scientific" views of man, but will not depend on science. Rather, it will go beyond science in providing, in terms of the three areas above, an answer to *a*) man's experience of physical and mental disintegration; *b*) his transitory character and feelings of personal insecurity; and *c*) his loneliness and innate desire to live in community. —C. E. F.

471. S. M. PAVLINEC, "Auferstehung der Toten: Kerygma und Vorstellung," *CommViat* 1 (1, '58) 60-70.

An exposition of the NT doctrine of the resurrection of the dead with critical remarks on O. Cullmann's *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?* [cf. §§ 2-192r-193r].

472. H. H. REX, "Immortality of the Soul, or Resurrection of the Dead, or What?" *RefTheolRev* 17 (3, '58) 73-82.

O. Cullmann, in *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?* (London, 1958) [cf. §§ 2-192r-193r], is right in asserting that there is no textual basis for the Greek doctrine of immortality in the NT, but his conclusions concerning the resurrection of the body on the "Last Day" and an "intermediate state" which the dead occupy until the parousia are not only theologically unacceptable, but are based on a partial and forced exegesis. In particular, his exegesis of Phil 1:23 and 2 Cor 5:8 is wrong. These passages refer not to an "interim state" that would be the lot of all Christians, but to a special privilege of Paul himself as a martyr. However, when taken in the total context of the Apostle's teaching on the cross and the Resurrection, they can be applied to the Christian hope generally. Such an interpretation would remove the awkward notion of an "interim state" and a temporal "last day" and, by introducing the concept of a celestial body (2 Cor 5:1-3), would assure personal continuity and identity. Although this last concept rests entirely on faith, it can be expressed speculatively in terms of Sartre's theory of "consciousness."—F. P. G.

EARLY CHURCH, GNOSTICISM

473. A. CABANISS, "The Worship of the 'Most Primitive' Community," *Journ BibRel* 26 (4, '58) 318-321.

Recovery of the earliest Christian worship depends on an examination of the Pauline corpus of Galatians, Thessalonians and Second Corinthians. In the earliest community the Jewish religious calendar still prevailed despite

Pauline reservations. Pasch, Omer, Shabuoth and possibly Succoth were observed as well as the new moons and Sabbaths. Ceremonial acts, like the holy kiss, the vivid portrayal of the Crucifixion, repetition of the Lord's Prayer, public reading, the baptism-confirmation and the Eucharist are noted. Later Pauline letters refer to worship on the first day of the week, distinctions in the clerical offices and the employment of music, and they convey the impression that the worship was characterized by splendor, awe and pageantry.—J. H. C.

474. J. L. CHEEK, "The Apocrypha in Christian Scripture," *JournBibRel* 26 (3, '58) 207-212.

Among Protestants the authoritative canon has been permissive, and within this canon is a functional canon of lesser scope. The permissive canon should be extended to include the apocrypha. Early Christians used a Septuagintal canon which included the apocrypha. The Apostolic Fathers quote them, and these books have been accepted in primary or secondary status by the majority of Christians in every age.—J. H. C.

475. O. CULLMANN, "The Early Church and the Ecumenical Problem," *Angl TheolRev* 40 (3, '58) 181-189; (4, '58) 294-301.

I. Though in the early Church there was no ecumenical problem as it exists today, there were differences concerning personal loyalty, liturgy and doctrine. Yet such differences did not lead to the separation of Christian groups into distinct Churches. Such has happened today, and this problem is particularly keen in the relationship between Catholic and non-Catholic Churches. Though Catholics cannot envisage union without subjection to the Roman Primacy, and Protestants cannot envisage it except in the union of Churches of equal right, there is a fourfold lesson we can learn from the early ecumenical problems of the Church. (1) Through all differences the early Church never lost sight of its unity. It was the frequent teaching of Paul that even amid diversity all were "members of the Body of Christ." (2) Further, Paul energetically checked the divisive parties based on the cult of personality which often lies at the base of dissension. (3) Paul also called upon Christians to help the "weak in belief" by means of concession for the sake of unity, without, however, sacrificing basic Christian truths. (4) And even when insoluble dogmatic and liturgical differences caused tension in early Christian groups, the Church remained united in a bond of love.—J. W. C.

II. To promote actual fellowship, a *koinōnia*, between Catholics and non-Catholics, C suggests an annual monetary collection, to be taken among the two parties and then reciprocally exchanged. As a work of love this would be at least the minimum Catholics and non-Catholics could do to heal the rift now existing between them, without in the least yielding basic dogmatic and ecclesiastical positions. Christians have a prime example of this practice in the early Church when Paul, in several of his Epistles, seeks money for the poor of Jerusalem. Though no dogmatic question was settled at the first

council of the Church (as related in Acts 15 and Gal 2), namely the question of circumcision, still agreement was reached on the question of missions. Peter was to be the head of the Jewish-Christian mission, while Paul would head the Gentile-Christian mission. Later on, Paul realized the fact of the already separated Christendom and hence saw the need for an effort towards unity. Since the problem of circumcision was first raised by the Jewish-Christians, Paul saw that the sacrifice of gathering money for the poor of Jerusalem had to be made by the churches of his mission so that these latter might indicate that they too belonged to the same Church despite the dogmatic difference. In the changed situation today, caused by various factors, an ecumenical collection can only be reciprocal, serving to indicate some "belonging together" between the two Christian factions.—A. B. B.

476. J. LEIPOLDT, "Ein neues Evangelium? Das koptische Thomasevangelium übersetzt und besprochen," *TheolLitZeit* 83 (7, '58) 481-496.

L translates into German, with a brief commentary, the so-called *Gospel of Thomas* based on MS photographs published in P. Labib's *Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum of Old Cairo*, vol. I (Cairo, 1956), pl. 80-99. The Coptic papyrus codex (A.D. 500) includes a collection of 112 sayings or addresses of Jesus which "Didymos Judas Thomas" allegedly recorded. The Coptic text clearly stems from a Greek original. The logia are in part variants of the Lord's words in the Synoptics, in part completely new; often there is evidence of Gnostic influence. L considers the *Gospel of Thomas* extremely significant, since (1) it is a graphic example of a "*Spruchsammlung*" and (2) it offers a glimpse into a stream of Synoptic traditions which is independent of the NT Gospels.—J. Bz.

477. C. MOHRMANN, "'Locus refrigerii, lucis et pacis,'" *QuestLitPar* 39 (3, '58) 196-214.

A study of the vocabulary of Christian antiquity related to the future life shows strong biblical influence both in the images and in the words themselves.

478. A. D. NOCK, "A Coptic Library of Gnostic Writings," *JournTheolStud* 9 (2, '58) 314-324.

A series of observations on the contents of the Jung Codex and on Valentinian Gnosticism. [Cf. § 3-242.]

479. H.-M. SCHENKE, "Die fehlenden Seiten des sog. Evangeliums der Wahrheit," *TheolLitZeit* 83 (7, '58) 497-500.

[Cf. § 3-242.] Pages 33-36 are missing in the Malinine-Puech-Quispel edition of the so-called *Evangelium Veritatis* from the Jung Codex. The pages missing in the Zurich MS, along with the twelve other codices belonging to the sensational discovery at Nag-Hammadi, have come into the possession of the Coptic Museum of Old Cairo and meanwhile have been published: P. Labib

Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum of Old Cairo, vol. I (Cairo, 1956), pl. 1-46. Plates 5, 6, 9 and 10 supply the four missing pages. S translates them into German.—J. Bz.

480. A. C. SUNDBERG, "The Old Testament of the Early Church (A Study in Canon)," *HarvTheolRev* 51 (4, '58) 205-226.

Study of the Alexandrian canon hypothesis, examination of the arguments favoring the hypothesis, and re-evaluation of the status of canonical usage in Judaism at the time of the emergence of Christianity would make it appear that the hypothesis is now commonly received only because its basic presuppositions have been forgotten. Once these presuppositions have been recognized, the light cast on them by modern research reveals the hypothesis as not only unprovable, as Pfeiffer had admitted, but also erroneous. As an alternative hypothesis, the following proposals can be made. (1) The scriptures of Judaism were commonly circulated throughout Palestine in Greek as well as in the original Semitic languages. (2) Previous to Jamnia, canonical practice in Palestine included closed collections of Law and Prophets, and also a large, undefined group of religious writings including the books later designated as "Writings" in the Jewish canon, the books of the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, and, perhaps, other writings now lost. It was this loose canon that was first taken over by the early Church. (3) Later, at Jamnia, the canon of Judaism was established, apparently as an anti-apocalyptic movement. Nevertheless, certain non-apocalyptic books not included in the canon continued to circulate in Jewish hands. The Eastern Church, following the Jewish canonical list, excluded these books from its OT. However, the lenient attitude of the Jews toward these books resulted in their being retained in the OT of the Western Church. (4) The canon of the OT took its final form in the Church as the resultant between the forces of Christian usage that tended to maintain a book as canonical in the Church, and the *a priori* claims of the Jewish canon that tended to restrict the Christian OT to the limits of the Jewish definition of scripture.—J. C. O'B.

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

481. W. F. ALBRIGHT, "Literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Matters; The Gnostic Codices from Chenoboskion," *BullAmSchOrRes* 151 ('58) 34-35.

A brief critical bulletin of recent books on the scrolls and the Nag-Hammadi MSS.

482. J. M. BAUMGARTEN, "1QSa 1.11—Age of Testimony or Responsibility?" *JewQuartRev* 49 (2, '58) 157-160.

[Cf. §§ 2-649; 3-263.] Against the objections of S. B. Hoenig in *JewQuartRev* 48 (4, '58) 371-375, B defends his view that 1QSa 1:11 deals with the age-qualifications of witnesses.

483. S. B. HOENIG, "Halakhic Implications of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Tradition* 1 (1, '58) 64-76.

Amid the many divergent and often fanciful conclusions being drawn from the scrolls by Christian and Jewish scholars, orthodox Jews must consider the halakhic implications of the discoveries if they are genuine. The biblical texts present problems regarding the canonicity of Esther, the order of phylactery passages, and the textual transmission of the Torah. The non-biblical texts pose many questions regarding the role of the Teacher of Righteousness, Jewish thought in the Second Commonwealth and legal traditions. Modern orthodoxy need not fear the consequences, for as S. Zeitlin has demonstrated, the scrolls are the work of 6th- or 7th-century Karaites and thus are not of halakhic significance.—G. W. M.

484. A. JAUBERT, " 'Le pays de Damas,' " *RevBib* 65 (2, '58) 214-248.

Commentators have suggested that the exile to "Damascus" mentioned in the Damascus Document (CDC) refers to the sojourn at Qumran itself or, according to I. Rabinowitz (*JournBibLit* 73 ['54] 11-35), to the Exile in Babylon in 586 B.C. Both suggestions are considered here, and a detailed study of several passages in CDC (chiefly 1:3-9; 3:10—4:4; 5:15—6:11; 7:9—8:2) substantiates both hypotheses. The principle of interpretation involved is a recognition of "an analogical or typological concept of history in which past events are considered as though transparent and become a perpetual lesson for the present." There is in CDC a clear association of references to "Damascus" and to a renewal of the covenant and of the spirit of worship. "Damascus" is related to the "wilderness of the peoples," where God made the exiles enter into the bond of the covenant (Ezek 20:37). Thus allusion to the Exile in terms of "Damascus" is intended to suggest primarily the place where the faithful remnant renewed their spiritual relations with God. Secondly, the expression connotes the withdrawal—to Qumran, in fact—of the spiritual exiles of contemporary times for the purposes of another spiritual renewal. The Zadokites assimilate themselves spiritually to their forbears, the exiles at Babylon.

Respecting the same sort of typological principle, one may also seek to identify the "Teacher of Righteousness" of CDC 1:11. To satisfy many points of exegesis, the choice of Ezra as leader of the spiritual renewal of the faithful remnant returning from the Exile seems the most satisfactory. Here again, Ezra the Teacher may possibly have been regarded as the type of the contemporary Teacher of Righteousness mentioned in the Habakkuk Commentary.—G. W. M.

485. S. V. McCASLAND, " 'The Way,' " *JournBibLit* 77 (3, '58) 222-230.

"The Way" is a designation of Christianity used at least six times as a technical term in Acts. Its exact meaning, obscure until now, becomes clear through a comparison with the Qumran Manual of Discipline (1QS 8:1—

10:21). The expression has its roots in Isa 40:3. This passage was applied by the Evangelists to John the Baptist and by Qumran to the entire community. The parallel usage by Qumran and the NT seems to indicate quite clearly that it is from Qumran that the early Christians took the expression. The contact between the two groups most probably came through John the Baptist as is indicated in Acts 18:24 and Mt 21:32.—F. C. M.

486. A. N. POLIAK, "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Approach," *JewQuartRev* 49 (2, '58) 89-107.

A careful re-examination of scroll evidence shows that parallels with Christianity and Second Commonwealth Jewry are not to be over-stressed. Though variously interpreted at different times in Jewish history, *Kittim* was never vague or undefined in meaning. Since archaeological and paleographical evidence is not yet conclusive, the scrolls themselves are the only clue for dating, and they force us to accept a medieval date, since the *Kittim* of the War can be none other than the Seljuk Turks.—S. E. S.

487. R. POTTER, "The Quest for God in the Judean Desert. I. The Men of Qumran," *LifeSpir* 13 (146-147, '58) 115-122.

A popular introduction to the sect of Qumran and its religious ideals.

488. I. RABINOWITZ, "The Guides of righteousness," *VetTest* 8 (4, '58) 391-404.

The expression *moreh haṣṣedeq*, occurring in the Qumran texts and generally translated "teacher of righteousness," is rendered by R "guide of righteousness" and explained in the sense of "leader, one who has authority to put the law into effect and to issue commands in the expectation that he will be obeyed . . . by all righteous persons." This meaning is supported by other occurrences of the expression or of its component elements in both biblical and extra-biblical literature. The expression is a title denoting sometimes a person of the past, sometimes a person of the future and sometimes even the office of the guide without any reference to the person holding that office. The date of the contemporary guide of righteousness or the equivalent guide of the regathering (of Israel) is said to be the early Maccabean period. As regards identification R proposes Mattathias and Judas as candidates for the title and office of guide of righteousness and guide of the regathering of Israel.—P. P. S.

489. C. ROTH, "The Jewish Revolt Against the Romans (66-73) in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *PalExpQuart* 90 (2, '58), 104-121.

Considering Menahem as the Teacher of Righteousness [*cf.* § 2-169], and the Zealots of Masadah as the Dead Sea sect, we may use the Dead Sea literature to supplement and correct Josephus' account of the war against Rome. Upon the death of Judah the Galilean (after he and his followers had entered upon the Damascus Covenant), Menahem became leader of the Zealots. He,

in turn, was killed about A.D. 66 after an unsuccessful thrust at Jerusalem, when he tried to rally the partisan leaders, including Simon ben Giora (the Man of Lies). Menahem's followers now retired to Masadah under Eleazar ben Jair (who may now be the Teacher) to escape the Wicked Priest (Eleazar ben Hananiah) and the Romans, and this withdrawal may well have been a major turning point in the war against Rome. Corrupted by power, Eleazar ben Hananiah may have attacked Qumran and seems ultimately to have fallen into the hands of the Romans (*peshet* on Psalm 37).

The Last Priest of Qumran literature is obviously Phanni ben Samuel (Phineas of Habta), a Zealot, chosen by lot. He worked in collusion with the "activist" Zealot faction (under Eleazar ben Simon) who controlled the inner court of the Temple. After 68, hostilities broke out between the Galileans (under John of Gischala), who are the Ephraim of the *peshet* on Psalm 37, and the Zealots (under the High Priest and Eleazar ben Simon); in this conflict the latter were "redeemed by God." This John also seems to have been the Lion of Wrath who persecuted the Pharisees ("makers of smooth interpretations").

The Masadah Zealots occupied the Qumran buildings to which Eleazar ben Simon sent copper scrolls listing the hiding places of his Temple loot. With the entry of the Romans into the Holy City, the prophecies of woe were fulfilled and hence the immediately subsequent writings of Qumran are full of hope in God's deliverance.—S. E. S.

490. K. SMYTH, "The Teacher of Righteousness," *ExpTimes* 69 (11, '58) 340-342.

K. Stendahl's proposal in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York, 1957) of comparing a "nucleus" of the NT to a Qumran religion centred on the Teacher is groundless, as is also the notion that the Teacher is responsible for the eschatological strain in the thought of the community. H. H. Rowley (*The Teacher of Righteousness and the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Manchester, 1957]) has a more reasonable approach: the Teacher was not even considered a Messiah, and to claim that he was expected to rise from the dead is unwarranted conjecture; so also to refer to him as a prophet. The essence of Christianity is the linking of salvation to the historical person of Jesus; at Qumran, the real "savior" was the Law.—S. E. S.

491. H. F. D. SPARKS, "The Scrolls and the New Testament," *Listener* 60 (Nov. 6, '58) 723-724.

In the present state of scholarly research and popular interest in the scrolls, the appearance of *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; London, 1958) is opportune. The various contributors, however, are more unanimous on basic assumptions of date and provenance of the scrolls than the facts warrant. It is not clear that the community was Essene and still less that all the non-biblical documents derive from them. The essays also show

how much depends on individual translation and interpretation; thus, is the Teacher of Righteousness the founder of the sect, who will rise again at the end of days, or is he simply the accredited community teacher who will "stand" to teach in any given period? Parallels there are between the NT and the scrolls, but also divergences no less remarkable; the fairest conclusion is that both are independent, though parallel, offshoots of the parent Jewish tree. Extrinsic parallels to the NT are no new thing, nor is the truth of the NT bound up with its "originality," as many imagine. The truth or falsity of the basic claims of early Christianity can neither be established nor affected in any way by a comparison of the NT with Qumran material, even granted all the parallels that can possibly be drawn.—G. G.

492. M. TREVES, "The date of the war of the sons of light," *VetTest* 8 (4, '58) 419-424.

The War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness is neither an apocalyptic nor an eschatologico-Messianic document. It was composed for a specific historical situation. Its date is fixed in the Maccabean age, more precisely about 143 B.C. It does not emanate from any Jewish sect; its author was a *hasid*, a member of a society of pious Jews who were zealous observers of the Law. The Sons of the Light are the tribes of Levi, Judah and Benjamin. Naturally, the Sons of Darkness are the Seleucids and their allies, the enemies of the Jews.—P. P. S.

493. V. VILAR, "Las excavaciones de Qumrán," *EstBib* 17 (2, '58) 208-223.

An account of the archaeology of Qumran and of life at Qumran as known through the excavations, based on the reports of R. de Vaux in recent volumes of *RevBib*.

494. P. WINTER, "Note on Salem-Jerusalem," *NovTest* 2 (2, '57) 151-152.

[Cf. § 2-64.] The identification of Shalem with Jerusalem in Genesis Apocryphon, col. 22, 11. 13-17, is a gloss and does not help solve the problem of the location of Shalem.

BOOKS AND OPINIONS

Reference Works

BOOK:

495r. F. L. CROSS, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (London-New York-Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1957, \$17.50), xix and 1492 pp.

From Aaron to Zwingli, the ODCC (official abbreviation) offers more than 6000 cross-referenced articles (nearly 4600 biographies), *ex professo* historical and documentary rather than exclusively sectarian, as a reference work for professional churchmen and educated laity alike. Admittedly it gives fuller attention to "Western Christendom than to Eastern Orthodoxy, to Christianity in Britain than to that of the continent, to the events of the nineteenth century than to those of the tenth" (p. v). While the biblical entries, due to lack of space, are "of an elementary kind," still the ODCC "will put the student of church history in possession of a larger body of bibliographic material than any other work of similar compass" (p. vi). Since 1939, under the direction of Cross, Oxford's Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, the ODCC numbers almost 100 independent contributors who drafted roughly half the entries; the immediate associates of the editor completed the other half, revised previous contributions if necessary and compiled the bibliographies. For this reason all the articles are anonymous. More than 200 reference works (pp. xi-xix) are utilized.

OPINION:

496r. In American and European journals the critical reception of ODCC has been in general highly favorable. E. KRENZ in *ConcTheolMon* 29 (3, '58) 236-237 notes the objectivity of ODCC which "no English-speaking Lutheran pastor ought to be without." In the *ExpTimes* 69 (3, '57) 73-74 the ODCC is recommended as a reference book for all, though the inaccuracies of the Scottish historical articles are "spots in the sun." Y. M.-J. CONGAR in *TheolLitZeit* 83 (8, '58) 579-580 extols its historical scholarship and catholicity of view, recommends further articles (on *Communicatio in sacris, Litterae formatae, Intercommunio* . . .). The *AnglTheolRev* 40 (1, '58) 76-77 lauds ODCC's "factual information on every aspect of Christianity, especially in its historical development," for "we have greatly needed just such a volume for a long time."

497r. In *Commentary* 26 (3, '58) 252-260, S. E. HYMAN, "raised in the Jewish faith but infidel there too, and without pretensions to the professional study of theology," notes that the "aim of the ODCC seems in fact no less than to undo the Reformation, at least for the Church of England." Thus the Thirty-Nine Articles of 1562 are only given a loose assent, the Middle Ages are now described as "one of the most creative," and Fox's *Book of Martyrs* is criticized for "credulity and bitterness." The ODCC ignores "the

proponents of the myth theory" of Jesus of Nazareth ("there does not seem to have been any such place before the 3rd or 4th century"), inclines "to be particularly harsh with the aggressively evangelical Protestant sects," and "its arrogance toward Judaism seems equally striking." K. SMYTH in *Studies* 47 (185, '58) 112-114 finds that ODCC is "well-informed and precise in stating the true Catholic position for each item of Catholic belief, and Catholics will actually find themselves grateful to the editor." But some inaccuracies dealing with Ireland are regrettable, e.g., in the statement that "the Church of Ireland lost the adherence of the majority to Rome" during Cromwellian times, it is implied that the majority formerly did not adhere to Rome; also some hagiographic defects are traceable to a practical unawareness of Delehaye's *Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Decembris*. The *Month* 19 (1, '58) 55-56 underlines the ODCC as a valuable reference work, factual and "very fair," with a mid-20th-century up-to-date-ness. That the ODCC treats Catholic themes with "great objectivity" and Newman with "manifest sympathy" is evident to J. A. JUNGSMANN, *ZeitKathTheol* 80 (2, '58) 362-363. Of the same opinion, D. H. MANOIR, *Irénikon* 30 (4, '57) 489-490, adds that while doctrinal and patristic articles are excellent, "certain liturgical and hagiographic ones could have profited somewhat from further critical research."

498r. In *RechThéolAncMéd* 25 (1-2, '58) 152-153 B. CAPELLE underscores that only the anonymity of ODCC's entries keep it from being rated as a work "d'avant garde," though Mary's Assumption seems presented as "a major case in the development of dogma." In *ScotJournTheol* 11 (3, '58) 320-321, T. F. TORRANCE discovers in the ODCC an Anglican bias especially toward the Church of Scotland, hardly a Scottish scholar in the list of contributors, and "deplorable ignorance and bad judgment" in "some of the articles on the Reformation." Though the ODCC is "invaluable to the student and the scholar," it is "a pity . . . that it should be called the *Oxford* Dictionary of the Christian Church when in point of fact it is essentially an *Anglican* Dictionary." In the eyes of G. THILS, *EphTheolLov* 34 (3, '58) 547, the major deficiency of the ODCC, otherwise a first-rate reference work, is the inadequacy of the articles on dogmatic theology in general: e.g., ecclesiology, "the science of the building and decoration of churches," in nine lines; infallibility, counsels of perfection (both without bibliographies), etc. Cf. also the short reviews of M. DERRICK, *Tablet* 210 (Dec. 14, '57) 540; P. FRANSEN, *Bijdragen* 19 (1, '58) 105-106; E. A. SMITH, *JournBibLit* 77 (2, '58) 182; W. K. KÜMMEL, *TheolRund* 24 (4, '58) 326.—K. F. D.

BOOK:

499r. *Vocabulaire Biblique*, ed. J.-J. VON ALLMEN (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1954, 1700 fr.), 314 pp.

A Companion to the Bible, ed. J.-J. Von Allmen, introduction by H. H. Rowley (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958, \$6.00), 480 pp.

Thirty-six Protestant scholars have collaborated to produce this encyclopedic

dictionary of key words from the Bible which has recently appeared in an English translation. For each word is given: (1) its meaning in various contexts, (2) biblical references, (3) its historical origin and development, and (4) cross references to similar terms. Many potentially controversial articles have been treated with conservative restraint.

OPINION:

500r. This work has been hailed by most reviewers as an almost indispensable tool for the biblical scholar. All the reviewers praise it, and while a few would take issue with one or two of the more controversial articles (e.g., Mary, Eucharist, etc.), no one denies that it is an excellent compendium of current theological opinion.

Among the reviewers of the original French edition, many mention its reliance upon and similarity to Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. P. GRECH in *VerbDom* 33 (4, '55) 243-244 notes that "most of the articles are very well written, with deep erudition and piety." He calls for a Catholic work of similar caliber "even though the present work is quite free from any polemic spirit and composed in a truly scientific manner." Writing in *Biblica* 36 ('55) 375, R. DYSON thinks "its general objectivity and irenic spirit will commend it . . . to . . . students who do not share all the views of the authors." He calls it "a valuable aid for the mature Catholic student." E. MAY in *CathBibQuart* 19 (2, '57) 269-270, while not thoroughly pleased with the article on "Pardon," is nonetheless favorably impressed by "Numbers" and "Family (N.T.);" and says about the articles in general that "long or short, they deal adequately with the key words and ideas of the Old and New Testaments." Although C. MATAGNE in *NouvRevThéol* 80 (4, '58) 424-425 agrees that, of the key words, "nothing essential has been neglected," he would prefer the editor to have included: (1) specific articles on a few other subjects (e.g., Adam, Lord, etc.), (2) an analytical index to facilitate finding such terms in the given articles, (3) some notation of equivalent terms (e.g., Penitence and Repentance), and (4) a more proper understanding of the Catholic position on some points (e.g., Church, Priesthood, etc.). I. FRANSEN, reviewing the work in *RevBén* 68 (1-2, '58) 125-126, observes that what is worthy of special attention is the very unified view of Scripture manifest in the work of this diversified group, and noting the care the authors take "not to offend the feelings of Catholics," he adds, "As it is, this 'vocabulary' will be, in the biblical movement of our era, a favorable element towards restoring the unity of the People of God."

501r. Reviewing the new English translation, W. DAVIES in *JournBibLit* 77 (3, '58) 287 notes that "French clarity is here at its best in the service of the Scriptures," and he highly recommends the book for "the insight it often gives to the thinking of some of the leading continental scholars." The reviewer in the *ExpTimes* 69 (10, '58) 290-291 remarks about this edition

that "it belongs to the theologies of the Bible far more than to the dictionaries of the Bible," and he proceeds to demonstrate his point by a consideration of the article on "Law." He concludes: "The book is a library in itself; and it is written with such grace and clarity of style that scholar and layman alike will be able to use it." Cf. also the brief review of D. M. v. d. H. in *Irénikon* 30 (2, '57) 245-246.—S. E. S.

Synoptic Gospels

BOOK:

502r. J. M. ROBINSON, *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Markus-Evangeliums*, Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 30 (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1956, 14.50 Sw. fr.), 113 pp.

The Problem of History in Mark, Studies in Biblical Theology No. 21 (London: SCM Press, 1957, 8 s.), 95 pp.

The author seeks to define Mark's understanding of history chiefly by letting the Evangelist speak for himself. The initial chapter describes the trends in Gospel criticism of a little over a century with respect to the Markan concept of history. R denotes four categories of interpretation: immanent objective history, non-historical theology, mythology and theologically understood history. R's investigation, however, though it throws light on these trends, purports to be independent of them. It is the introduction to Mark (1:1-13) which presents the inauguration of eschatological history in the Baptism and Temptation of Jesus. Here the powers of the Spirit and Satan meet in the struggle that Christ is to continue in the new era of Christian history that is beginning. The cosmic conflict of the Spirit and Satan represents the transcendental aspect of history, whose more immanent aspects appear in Mark as the conflicts between the Son of God and demoniacs in the exorcism narratives and between Jesus and His opponents in the debate narratives. The Spirit is Mark's designation of the divine power at the end of time, operative already in the history of Jesus, propelling the whole course of history toward its ultimate destiny; thus the eschatological dimension of Markan history. The victory of the Spirit, of Jesus, comprises another important part of this history. The Resurrection is the conclusive thwarting of evil and the conclusive establishment of God's reign in history. History from the Resurrection on, Mark conceives as a continuation of the same cosmic struggle, but with the added character of an accomplished, decisive victory. This view of history, finally, informs Mark's understanding of Christian existence itself in the Church.

OPINION:

503r. In general, R's work has been received with great cordiality and high praise for its real contribution to Markan studies. Among reviewers of the English volume, W. NEIL in *ScotJournTheol* 10 (3, '57) 313-314 notes that though the antithesis of the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan in

Mark is well known to all students of this Gospel, no one before R has "so fully and suggestively" developed its "place as the *Leitmotiv* of the Gospel, influencing both Mark's presentation of Jesus and his conception of the role of the Church in the world." According to G. B. CAIRD in *JournBibLit* 76 (4, '57) 318-319, this monograph "deals with one small but extremely significant part of a problem which has been raised afresh by the debate on demythologizing, and deals with it more effectively and more lucidly than either Bultmann or his German critics." Caird attributes R's success to his determination to avoid superimposing his own view of history on Mark and to let Mark speak for himself. The reviewer regrets, however, that sufficient importance was not given to the Markan Passion narrative in establishing the thesis. V. TAYLOR in *ExpTimes* 68 (11, '57) 328-329, as well as other reviewers, would not agree that R's book is "lucid": "Lucidity appears to be the first victim of the more heady forms of present-day criticism. The sheer ability of the book, however, encourages us to believe that the author may not have said his last word about the problem of history in Mark." A short notice of the book is given by V. T. O'KEEFE in *TheolStud* 18 (4, '57) 635.

504r. Reviewing the German volume in *JournRel* 38 (1, '58) 54-55, M.

BARTH agrees with two of the points raised by Caird: approval of R's methodological premise of seeking only the intention of Mark himself and disapproval of the lack of sufficient emphasis upon the Passion narrative. Barth's estimate of the book is certainly laudatory: "Robinson has written a well-structured book, which bristles with sharp observations, which draws out important lines, and which, above all, has a message that may be heard and understood beyond the walls of libraries and scholarly studies." K. FRÖLICH, who translated R's work into German, finds, in *TheolZeit* 14 (3, '58) 224-225, that the particular value of this "bold and inspiring thesis" lies in the fact that R's search for Mark's understanding of history has led him to bring out in its outlines a sort of theology of the earliest Evangelist. For J. GIBLET in *CollMech* 42 (4, '57) 421-422 the fact that in presenting Mark's Gospel "as an apocalypse," R has "perhaps schematized a bit too much" detracts but little from the importance of the work for the understanding of the Synoptics. F. J. SCHIERSE in *Scholastik* 32 (4, '57) 616-617 welcomes the lesson that we can derive from the book regarding our own attitude towards our participation in history conceived as a struggle. But he questions whether R has done justice to the necessary role of faith in appreciating the changes wrought upon history by the coming of Christ. In a short review in *ExpTimes* 69 (2, '57) 49 H. H. ROWLEY expresses surprise that R did not underline the contrast between the Markan battle-aspect of history and "the Battle of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, to which the sect of the Scrolls looked forward, a battle to be fought with swords and spears, and to be won by killing rather than by dying." O. KUSS gives the book a brief notice in *TheolGlaub* 47 (5, '57) 384.—G. W. M.

BOOK:

505r. R. LAURENTIN, *Structure et théologie de Luc 1 à 2*, Études Bibliques (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1957, 1700 fr.), 232 pp.

This work is an attempt to analyze the text of Lk 1-2 in function of its sources and the milieu of its composition. The first two chapters of Luke emanated from a Judaeo-Christian atmosphere where faith in Christ, the knowledge of Scripture, Jewish culture and midrashic exegesis had attained a high degree of development. The reflections of the exegete on these two chapters have for their impetus a faith that is firm, which, paradoxically, is the condition for a truly fruitful scientific progress. These reflections are centered on a Lukan section that is of an extremely refined midrashic genre.

The introduction of the book deals with the problem of the original language of the text, its author and its homogeneity. The first three chapters outline a plan, examine the directing idea (Dan 9 and Mal 3) and investigate the use of the OT (Zeph 3:14-17; 2 Sam 7; Exod 40:35; etc.) in Lk 1-2. Chapter IV treats of the literary genre of these Lukan chapters; ch. V determines whether Lk 1-2 establishes the Messiahship of Jesus upon a transcendent and divine plane; finally, ch. VI evaluates the typology of the "Daughter of Sion" and the "Eschatological Tabernacle." Two appendices are devoted to the problem of Mary's knowledge of her Son's divinity and to Mary's virginity. A bibliography that includes 500 entries is also appended.

OPINION:

506r. J. COPPENS in *EphTheolLouv* 33 (4, '57) 729-735 sums up the principal conclusions of L's book as follows. (1) The redaction of the Gospel of the Infancy is Luke's, who translated and utilized a Hebrew document. (2) The Gospel of the Infancy sets up a parallelism between the infancy of the Baptist and that of the Savior. (3) Lk 1-2 is characterized by the midrashic use of OT texts. (4) The Evangelist develops two leading ideas: that of the divinity of Christ as "Lord" and "Son of God" and that of the role of Mary as "Daughter of Sion" and "Eschatological Tabernacle." (5) Lk 1-2 derives mainly from two sources: Mary's recollections and the Johannine traditions. Generally speaking, we are not dealing here with an historic work in the modern acceptation of the term, but with a "religious history written in the biblical manner." Of course, questions may arise whether the concessions made by L to the literary genre of midrash constitute a danger to Catholic dogma; whether anything is left of the religious truths inculcated by the Gospel of the Infancy; or, above all, whether there remains any historical foundation to these truths. It must be acknowledged that L, whose devotion to Mary cannot be called in question, traces amid these difficulties a sure way which, ignoring none of the problems, leads us to a penetrating and courageous exegesis of the first two chapters of Luke.

507r. S. MUÑOZ IGLESIAS, "Estructura y teología de Lucas I-II," *EstBib* 17 (1, '58) 101-107, sees that certain reservations are necessary in accepting L's parallelism between Jesus and the Baptist, his conclusions concerning the prophecies of Daniel and Malachi and their relation to Lk 1-2, and his assertion that the Lukan Gospel of the Infancy attempts to identify Jesus with Yahweh and Mary with the Daughter of Sion. Iglesias considers the study of OT parallels adduced by L incomplete and unconsciously tendentious; the facility with which he finds parallels to confirm his theory, excessive and at times artificial. L seems to forget that, from a simple similarity in expression, one cannot conclude to an identity of content. However, disagreement with certain points made by him notwithstanding, L deserves our congratulations for having adopted an exegetical method which is most apt for investigating the intentions of the Evangelist and thereby penetrating the doctrine revealed in the chapters in question.

508r. P. BENOIT in *RevBib* 65 (3, '58) 427-432, rejecting L's assertion that Luke, in the first two chapters of his Gospel, translated a Hebrew document, reiterates his own view that the Evangelist himself wrote those chapters in a Greek that imitated the LXX. He raises several questions about the Magnificat, the royal Messiah of Israel and the sacerdotal Messiah of Aaron. He disagrees with L's response to the question about Mary's virginity. However, reservations and disagreements expressed about L's book are only qualifications put upon an immense admiration for and approbation of his work. The principal fault of the book is a tendency to exaggerate possible inductions, but this fault by excess is far less serious than its contrary, which is satisfied with an exploration of merely the philological surface of the text without properly evaluating its third dimension, its typological profundity.

509r. In *VerbCaro* 12 (46, '58) 199-201, M.T. finds that though he cannot share all L's views, the work gives hope of a Christological recentering of Marian piety and a path to ecumenism. L's work, a meditation which is Christian in its foundation, Hebrew in its intellectual and literary form, is a biblical theology that is the result of solid philological and literary research. We have in this book a major contribution destined to open new perspectives on biblical theology, Christology and biblical Mariology. P. WINTER in *TheolLit Zeit* 83 (9, '58) 625-627 expresses his thanks to L for the objective way in which the latter presented a wealth of material about Lk 1-2 that has hitherto been widely scattered in so many different periodicals. M. D. GOULDER in *JournTheolStud* 9 (2, '58) 338-360 calls attention to a serious consequence following from L's very success: "For the more thickly sown symbolisms are seen to be, the more unlikely it becomes that these details are also historical, and historicity is for him of the essence." He concludes his review by asking whether L has not "cooked the goose he most cherishes? When he has eaten his symbolic cake, will he not find that the historical one is gone also?"—S. B. M.

BOOK:

510r. O. CULLMANN, *The Early Church*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, trans. A. J. B. Higgins and S. Godman (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956, 25 s. or \$4.50), 217 pp.

Introducing this translation of ten of his essays published over the past fifteen years, C hopes that they will make clearer "the critical-theological position which informs my larger and better-known writings," an important consideration, since "I have not committed myself to any of the current theological trends." Two facts he hopes will emerge: his unreserved adherence to "the historical-philological method as the foundation of all interpretation of the oldest Christian documents" and his resolute rejection for scientific reasons of "the theological preconceptions of a modernizing interpretation which are commonly associated with the historical-philological method." These he describes as "preconceptions which, in the interest of some philosophical theory or other, seek to strip off as a mere external garment or forcedly to reinterpret the very thing which is *central* to the faith of the first Christians." Finally, he hopes that his conclusion, "that the real centre of early Christian faith and thought is *redemptive history* (*Heilsgeschichte*)," will be given greater scope in the interpreting of the NT.

OPINION:

511r. I. "The Necessity and Function of Higher Criticism." J. M. ROBINSON in *JournBibLit* 76 (2, '57) 172-173, H. N. BREAM in *JournRel* 37 (4, '57) 279-281, and C. K. BARRETT in *TheolLitZeit* 83 (7, '58) 520-522 describe this essay as a statement of C's basic conviction: the need for scientific disciplines to cope with the incarnational elements of revelation, the coordinate need for theological interpretation, since beyond accidental form, revelation communicates absolute truth. C. P. CEROKE in *CathBibQuart* 19 (2, '57) 282-284 remarks the similarity of this to the point made by papal directives about exegesis' use of scientific tools. In noting C's emphasis on the *Heilsgeschichte*, Robinson suggests the need for careful definition of "history" as used by C and by Bultmann, whose approach C rejects.

II. "The Origin of Christmas"; VIII. "*ho opisō mou erchomenos*"; IX. "Samaria and the Origins of the Christian Mission." Bream describes these three essays as examples of C's skilled use of critical tools. Robinson regrets C's failure in essay VIII to emphasize Lukan material which stresses that Jesus came after John chronologically—a concern which is very similar to C's own.

512r. V. "The Kingship of Christ and the Church in the NT"; VI. "The Return of Christ." In these two essays, Bream finds the strong historical orientation of C's thinking. Robinson calls essay V remarkable for its synthesis without neglect of differences established by analysis. The history of salvation involves a chronological process from plurality (the election of Israel), to unity in Christ, to plurality of the saved in the Church. For C, the Church

and the *Regnum Christi* are concentric circles about Christ, and the kingdom of God is to come at the end, although it is also partially present—an element of detail which Robinson thinks C has not wholly succeeded in integrating. Robinson recalls that this essay, taken up later in C's *Christ and Time*, presented at its publication a "programmatic statement of right-wing Barthianism"; Bultmann is on the other wing. Essay VI, "basically a reply to 'thoroughgoing eschatology'" in Robinson's words, is C's explanation of the attitude of both Jesus and the Church toward the nearness of the *eschaton*. While for both the last days are present, Robinson finds an ambiguity in C's admission that both expected the end within a few decades. Herein Robinson discerns a deeper affinity between C and Bultmann. Bream wonders whether C has not too much limited his consideration of time to earthly history.

VII. "The Proleptic Deliverance of the Body According to the NT." Barrett and Bream note C's greater theological emphasis in this essay, turning as it does on ethical consequences for a Christian of the bodily resurrection of Christ.

X. "Early Christianity and Civilization." Barrett admires the way in which C discusses the complex attitude of the early Church toward the present world which passes and therefore is of no ultimate value, but is the obligatory framework for activity.

513r. III. "The Plurality of the Gospels as a Theological Problem in Antiquity"; IV. "The Tradition: The Exegetical, Historical and Theological Problem." In the first of these essays, C traces two conflicting tendencies in the early Church: to multiply gospels and to reduce all to unity. These were finally resolved when the Church canonized only four, not as strict biographies without discrepancy, but as witnesses to one faith from different points of view, as apostolic not merely in origin but also in content. In essay IV, called by Barrett "the weightiest piece in the book" and so treated by both M. ZERWICK in *Biblica* 39 (3, '58) 367-371 and Ceroke, C carries forward this explanation in a debate with Catholic writers on the nature and value of tradition. C's thesis, that the Church itself distinguished between apostolic and ecclesiastical tradition by canonizing the former in the Gospels as qualitatively superior to the latter, does not prevent him, according to Bream, from pointing out a growing rapprochement between Catholics and Protestants on the matter of tradition. Zerwick notes that this essay has been expanded to take account of the exchange especially with Daniélou; he objects, however, that although C displays in places remarkable appreciation of his adversaries, some of his statements of Catholic position are at the very least capable of misunderstanding. Thus Zerwick criticizes the implication that written formulation of tradition was intended as a sole and permanent norm; the occasional nature of NT writings indicates the contrary. Moreover, C's representation of the Catholic Church as claiming to exercise judgment over the word of God does not adequately show that explanation of revelation in its true sense rather

implies that the Church is subject to that revelation and to the Spirit. Ceroke suggests that C has raised "a fundamental issue on which discussion of the nature of tradition may be undertaken by Protestant and Catholic"; "What concept of tradition did the primitive Church entertain?" This will be answered, suggests Ceroke, only by further and more penetrating analysis, and may well reveal the necessity of a Church possessor of revelation rather than a Church possessed by revelation. Zerwick would add to C's statement that "divine Word and the sacraments" are the two "great contemporary miracles in our midst"; the Church is the third and greatest miracle. Bream commends the "admirably irenic spirit and commendable objectivity" of C's argument.

Of the collection as a whole, Robinson expects a contribution to C's role in American NT scholarship, and Ceroke notes that its appearance indicates C's importance among Protestant theologians. Bream welcomes it as an excellent opportunity to study the major facets of C's thinking and to enjoy his evident "learning without pedantry." Barrett, although he finds C's *Heilsgeschichte* theme a real contribution, feels that its application is too rigid to do full justice to the variety of NT thought; but he praises these essays as stimulating and provocative. Cf. also the brief notice by P. BENOIT in *RevBib* 65 (1, '58) 146-147.—J. F. Br.

BOOK:

514r. R. MARLÉ, *Bultmann et l'interprétation du Nouveau Testament*, Théologie, 33 (Paris: Aubier, Éditions Montaigne, 1956, 900 fr.), 205 pp.

The author attempts to grasp the thought of Bultmann in the light of his theological and philosophical background and to present it as objectively as possible by letting the subject speak for himself. There is consequently a wealth of citation from nearly all of B's works. The exposition follows the plan of the famous conference of 1941, "Neues Testament und Theologie." M interprets the points made in this conference both by what preceded it in the evolution of B's thought and by the reactions and further clarifications it has provoked. The first chapter situates B in contemporary Protestant theology in relation to the liberal and dialectical schools, form-criticism, history of religions and the philosophy of existence. Four chapters analyze B's thought in itself. M exposes successively B's concept of "myth" and his proposed program of demythologizing (ch. II), the principles of existential interpretation inspired by the philosophy of Heidegger (ch. III), the Bultmannian theology of faith and its relationships with philosophy (ch. IV), and the problem of Jesus, centered on B's interpretation of the cross and the Resurrection (cf. V). Each chapter contains a section entitled "Critical Reflections," and there is a "Conclusion" which gathers together the main points of the author's critical evaluation. A bibliography of B's principal works and of works about him is appended.

OPINION:

515r. In general, M's exposition has been praised for its spirit of objectivity, its scrupulous fidelity to all available sources and its comprehensive charity. L. MALEVEZ in *NouvRevThéol* 79 (2, '57) 201-202, while admiring the extent and solidity of M's research, regrets that he has not risked his own interpretation in places where the "letter" of B remains obscure. Malevez also thinks that the author should have defined more clearly the role attributed by B to the Person of Jesus, since on this point the opinions of interpreters are divided. P. BENOIT in *RevBib* 64 (3, '57) 453-455 suggests that M may have been too indulgent in some of his appreciations of B's thought and proposes the outlines of a more systematic exposition and refutation. This would consist in an analysis of the critical, rationalist and Lutheran presuppositions underlying the destructive aspect of B's enterprise and determining also its constructive aspect. Benoit finds M's "Conclusion" less satisfying than the last chapter of Malevez's *Le Message Chrétien et le Mythe*.

516r. E. LAMIRANDE in *RevUnivOtt* 27 (2, '57) 141*-142* emphasizes the importance for theologians of the fundamental problems of the relations of nature and grace, faith and reason, upon which M focuses his exposition and critique of B. In *Scholastik* 32 (4, '57) 579-580 B. BRINKMANN singles out for favorable comment M's insight into B's latent rationalism and individualism and the clarity with which he shows how B's synthesis is the natural consequence of a rigorous fidelity to the fundamental tenets of Protestantism. R. BULTMANN himself in *TheolLitZeit* 82 (4, '57) 241-250 expresses surprise that M should have formulated some of the same criticisms that he has also received from Protestant critics, notably H. Ott. While grateful to M for his comprehensive exposition, he feels that M, like many others, has misunderstood his thought on some essential points, in particular on the disjunction between myth and science, the separability of myth and kerygma (ch. II), and on the nature of existential analysis and its relationship to faith (chs. III-IV). He makes the point that M's critique reflects not only the contrast between Catholic thought and his own, but more fundamentally the contrast between Catholic and Lutheran theology on the important question of justification and faith.—F. P. G.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

BARNETT—Albert Edward Barnett, born in Opelika, Ala., Aug. 29, 1895, is a graduate of Birmingham College (1916), Emory University (B.D., 1921) and Chicago University (Ph.D., 1932). After teaching at the Garrett Biblical Institute, Northwestern (1944-50), he assumed his present post as Prof. of NT at the Candler School of Theology, Emory University. A member of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, he specializes in the NT canon and interpretation. Among his publications are: *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (1941), *The New Testament: Its Making and Meaning* (1946; rev. ed. due in 1959); *Understanding the Parables of Our Lord* (1940), *The Letters of Paul* (1947), *Disciples to Such a Lord: A Study of the Gospel according to Mark* (1957), "The Epistle of James" in *The Interpreter's Bible Dictionary* (now in press).

BLACK—Rev. Prof. Matthew Black, Editor of *New Testament Studies*, was born Sept. 3, 1908. Awarded his M.A. at Glasgow in 1930, he also received there his B.D. in 1934 and D.Litt. in 1944. Bonn conferred a Dr. Phil. in 1937 and Glasgow an honorary D.D. in 1954. He has taught as Assistant in Hebrew at Glasgow (1935-37); Assistant Lecturer in Semitic Languages and Literature at Manchester (1937-39); Bruce Lecturer, Trinity College, Glasgow (1940); Lecturer in NT Languages and Literature at Leeds (1947-52); Prof. of Biblical Criticism and Antiquities at Edinburgh (1952-53). A Fellow of the British Academy since 1955, Corresponding Member of the Göttingen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Morse Lecturer at the Union Theological Seminary, New York (1956), and honorary member of the Society of Biblical Literature (1958), he has published, among other works, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (2nd ed., 1954) and *A Christian Palestinian Syriac Horologion*, "Texts and Studies" (1954).

CHADWICK—Rev. Henry Chadwick, Co-Editor (with H. F. D. Sparks) of the *Journal of Theological Studies* and Regius Prof. of Divinity at Oxford, was born in Bromley, Kent, June 23, 1920. Educated at Eton (King's Scholar), he matriculated at Magdalene, Cambridge, where he graduated a Bachelor of Music in 1940. Ordained to the Anglican priesthood in 1943, he has served as Assistant Master at Wellington College (1945) and as Fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge (1946-48). In 1957 the University of Chicago welcomed him as a Visiting Prof., and the University of Glasgow conferred a D.D. *honoris causa*. A frequent contributor to theological periodicals, he has written *Origen, Contra Celsum* (1953), *The Sentence of Sextus: a Contribution to the history of early Christian Ethics* (1957), and edited with the late W. L. Knox *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels* (1953-57). Forthcoming is *Authority in the Early Church*.

GRANT—Rev. Robert M. Grant, Episcopal clergyman, was born in Evanston, Ill., Nov. 25, 1917. Educated at Northwestern (A.B.), Union Theological Seminary (B.D.) and Harvard (S.T.M., Th.D.), he has taught from 1944 to 1953 at the University of the South (Sewanee, Tenn.) as Instructor and then as Prof. of NT. A Research Associate in NT in the Federated Theological Faculty of Chicago University (1952-53), he has since then been Associate Prof. there. In his specialties, patristic studies and the history of biblical interpretation, his published works include, among others, *Second Century Christianity* (1946), *The Bible in the Church* (1948) and *The Letter and the Spirit* (1957). Due for publication within a year is *Gnosticism and Christianity*. Prof. Grant was recently elected President of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis for 1959.

KEPLER—Rev. Prof. Thomas Samuel Kepler was born at Mt. Vernon, Iowa, Sept. 20, 1897. A Methodist minister since 1927, he spent 1928-29 at Marburg and Cambridge. During a year as Research Fellow at Boston University, he received his Ph.D. there in 1931. As Prof. of Bible and Philology, he taught at Mt. Union College (1930-34) and as Prof. of Religion and Bible at Lawrence College (1934-46). Cornell awarded him the D.D. in 1940 and Baldwin-Wallace College the S.T.D. in 1950. Since 1946 he has been Prof. of NT in the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College. A member of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis and the American Theological Society and past president (Midwestern Section, 1949-50) of the National Association of Biblical Instructors, he has published *Contemporary Thinking About Jesus* (1944), *A Spiritual Journey with Paul* (1953) and *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary for Laymen* (1957). At present he is an Associate Editor of the multi-volume work, *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*.

RICCIOTTI—Titular Abbot of the Canons Regular of the Lateran, Giuseppe Ricciotti, S.T.D., was born Feb. 27, 1890, in Rome and ordained there in 1913. Early in his career he studied Oriental history and literature and travelled from Palestine to China on archaeological missions. A contributor to the *Enciclopedia Italiana*, he has taught since 1924 as Prof. of Hebrew and later of Semitic Languages and Oriental Christian History at the University of Rome. Abbot Ricciotti has served as Consultor to the Sacred Congregation of Religious and Procurator General of his Congregation. A prolific author, he first resolved to write his *Life of Christ* when he lay wounded as chaplain in World War I; today his *Vita di Gesù Cristo* (19th ed., 1951) has been translated into at least nineteen languages. Prominent among his other works on OT and NT themes are: *Storia d'Israele* (4th ed., 1944), *Paolo Apostolo* (4th ed., 1951; English trans. 1953) and *Gli Atti degli Apostoli* (1953; English trans. 1957).

SANDERS—Rev. Joseph Newbould Sanders, a priest of the Church of England, was born in Lancaster, England, July 19, 1913. He studied at Cambridge, where he is at present Lecturer in Divinity (1950—) and Dean and Chaplain of Peterhouse. A contributor to *Chamber's Encyclopedia, Theology, New Testament Studies*, and F. L. Cross' *Studies in Ephesians* (1956) and *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (1957), he has also published *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (1943) and *The Foundations of the Christian Faith* (1951). In preparation are articles treating: the Galatians, in Peake's Commentary; St. John's Gospel, Lazarus, and the Word, in the *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Also due to appear soon is a commentary on St. John for *Black's New Testament Commentary*.

WIKGREN—Rev. Allen Paul Wikgren, Baptist theologian, was born in Chicago, Dec. 3, 1906. A graduate of Chicago University, where he received his Ph.D. in 1932, he joined the faculty in 1941. From 1949 to 1953 an Associate Prof. of NT Language and Literature, he has since then served as Chairman of the Department of NT and Early Christian Literature in the Division of Humanities. His special fields of scholarship include biblical Greek, NT philology, text, canon, literature and interpretation. Editor-in-Chief of *Hellenistic Greek Texts* (1947; 2nd ed., 1958), co-editor and contributor to *New Testament Manuscript Studies* (1950) and *The Ancestry of Our English Bible* (3rd ed., 1956), he has also contributed to *The Interpreter's Bible Dictionary*, *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* (rev. ed.) and the new Peake Commentary. The latter three works are due for publication in the near future.

WORDEN—Rev. Thomas Worden, S.T.L., L.S.S., was born in Chorley, Lancashire, June 10, 1920. He pursued seminary studies at Upholland College (Wigan, Lancashire) and was ordained a Catholic priest for the Archdiocese of Liverpool. After graduate work at Fribourg, Switzerland, and the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome, he spent a year at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem. The editor of *Scripture*, he is currently teaching at Upholland College as Prof. of OT Exegesis and Biblical Theology and Prof. of Hebrew.

BOOK NOTICES

INTRODUCTION

W. BARCLAY, *More New Testament Words* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958, \$3.00), 160 pp.

The success of B's previous little book, *A New Testament Wordbook*, caused the publishers to ask for another similar volume, and the present work discusses twenty-four words. Among them are "Agape, Agapan: The Greatest of the Virtues"; "Logos: The Word of the Christian Message"; "Splagchnizesthai: The Divine Compassion." Originally published as articles in the *British Weekly*, these essays mediate to the ordinary readers the riches of Kittel's and Bauer's dictionaries.

Bible Key Words, Volume II, from Gerhard Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, trans. and ed. J. R. Coates and H. P. Kingdon (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958, \$4.00), xiv and 121, xiv and 67, xiv and 61, xii and 76 pp.

The second of the one-volume editions of *Bible Key Words* contains the following articles: *Lord* by W. Foerster and G. Quell; *Gnosis* by R. Bultmann; *Basileia* by K. L. Schmidt, H. Kleinknecht, K. G. Kuhn and G. von Rad; *Apostleship* by K. H. Rengstorf. Separate bibliographies and indexes are provided for each section. English readers will continue to appreciate the service being rendered by the translators and publishers in making some of the most important entries in Kittel so readily available.

L. BOUYER, *The Meaning of Sacred Scripture*, trans. Mary Perkins Ryan, Liturgical Studies, vol. V (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958, \$4.75), xii and 259 pp.

This work is an English translation of Fr. Bouyer's *La Bible et l'Évangile* (Paris, 1951). The author introduces the popular reader to both OT and NT, not by a formal study of the books, but through a series of twenty-two short essays on biblical themes, such as the Covenant, the qualities of God as seen in the prophets, the presence of God, Jewish mysticism, the kingdom, the Christian mystery, etc. The *Leitmotiv* of the entire volume is the progressive development of divine revelation. Two appendices treat of the forms of Jewish tradition.

W. J. KIEFER, S.M., *Biblical Subject Index* (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1958, \$4.50), viii and 199 pp.

The present work resulted from the author's own need of a topical and analytic concordance to supplement the usual verbal concordances. In order to assist others the Marianist Brother has published this volume which will be of most benefit to seminarians, priests, religion teachers in secondary schools and colleges, librarians and students in college religion classes.

Le Nouveau Testament traduit en français sous la direction de l'École Biblique de Jérusalem (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1958, 1,200 fr.), 880 pp., 3 maps.

In this inexpensive edition the translation of the various books has been revised to make it more uniform especially in the parallel passages of the Synoptics. The introductions to the individual books have been shortened, and the footnotes have been reduced by the elimination of many textual and historical

observations. On the other hand, more attention has been given to important technical terms, such as the Son of Man, and to concepts of greater moment in the history of revelation.

E. L. TITUS, *Essentials of New Testament Study* (New York: The Ronald Press, 1958, \$3.75), viii and 261 pp.

A member of the faculty of Southern California School of Theology, the author here intends to introduce the beginning student to the more important aspects of NT study. In writing the book he has been conscious of the need to be critical and, at the same time, to infuse the study with the religious spirit. The material is divided into three parts: Jewish Beginnings; An Age of Transition; Evangelism and Consolidation. At the end of each of the fourteen chapters "problem areas" are given and a selected bibliography of English titles.

L. D. TWILLEY, *The Origin and Transmission of the New Testament. A Short Introduction* (Edinburgh-London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957, 8 s. 6 d.), x and 69 pp.

This very brief introduction has two purposes: (1) to sketch the history of the early Church and furnish a chronology of the NT books, and (2) to give an outline of the textual transmission of the NT and of the work of criticism. The author states his own theories of dating in the text and gives alternative dates in added paragraphs of smaller print; limitations of space prevent full discussion of the arguments. Maps and charts are used to illustrate the origins of the NT books and the families of MSS.

A. WIKENHAUSER, *New Testament Introduction*, trans. J. Cunningham (New York: Herder and Herder, 1958, \$7.80), xx and 580 pp.

Professor Wikenhauser's (cf. Biog. Note 2 [2, '58] 197) Introduction represents the fruit of thirty years of university teaching. Within four years two German editions appeared, and the present work is based on the second revised German edition of 1956, but the author has brought the bibliography up to the spring of 1957. Here the reader will find a summary of continental scholarship, especially of the new advances made in Catholic circles.

J. D. WOOD, *The Interpretation of the Bible*, Studies in Theology (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1958, 10 s. 6 d.), 184 pp.

"Ignorance of how Christians have interpreted the Bible in the past is no proper qualification for the interpreter today." By this observation James D. Wood, Professor of Biblical Languages, Criticism and Exegesis at the Scottish Congregational College, Edinburgh, stresses the importance of the work he has undertaken in this book, subtitled "A Historical Introduction." After a brief explanation of the meaning of biblical interpretation, he discusses the Christian inheritance from Judaism with respect to interpretation, bringing out the fact that Jesus took "an independent line in the interpretation of the Law." The remainder of the book is a judicious survey of the principal figures and schools of interpretation down to the present day.

GOSPELS

H. DIEM, *Der irdische Jesus und der Christus des Glaubens*, Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte 215 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1957, DM 1.90), 20 pp.

In this pamphlet Dr. Diem, Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Tübingen, delineates the historical and theological aspects of the

question of the identity of the earthly Jesus and the Christ of faith. He reduces the question to that of the continuity of the history of preaching resulting in the identity of the subject of the preaching, Jesus Christ.

P. GAECHTER, S.J., *Petrus und Seine Zeit. Neutestamentliche Studien* (Innsbruck: Tyrolia Verlag, 1958, 125 Sch., DM 22), 458 pp.

Since 1946 the Dean of the Theological Faculty of the University of Innsbruck has been concerned with problems centering about Peter and the first decades of the Church. Five articles which had already appeared in various journals have been revised and two new chapters have been written for this book. The new essays concern the Church ministers at Corinth (1 Cor 1:2) and the limits of the apostolate of Paul. It is G's contention that Paul's vocation came only gradually and that he always considered himself subordinate to the original Twelve. In the various studies the author pays more than ordinary attention to the psychological background of the documents.

J. KNOX, *Jesus Lord and Christ* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958, \$4.00), x and 278 pp.

This work is a reprint in one volume of three of K's earlier works: *The Man Christ Jesus* (1941); *Christ the Lord* (1945); and *On the Meaning of Christ* (1947). The unity of the three works lies in their successive interpretations of Jesus as man, as Lord and Christ, and as center of the event of salvation. The author (*cf.* Biog. Note 2 [1, '57] 94) has made minor revisions in preparing the text for publication.

C. M. LAYMON, *Christ in the New Testament* (New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958, \$3.50), 256 pp.

The author, editor of adult publications, Editorial Division of the Board of Education, The Methodist Church, was from 1943-50 dean and professor of literature and history of the Bible at Scarritt College, Nashville. Drawing on Scripture, the latest sources of biblical scholarship and his own comments and insights, he seeks to present the total NT picture of Christ by relating the portraits in the twenty-seven books to the developing Christian community, to one another and finally to the Bible as a whole.

J. STEINMANN, *Saint John the Baptist and the Desert Tradition*, trans. M. Boyes, Men of Wisdom Books 5 (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958, \$1.50), 191 pp., 100 illustrations.

The author weaves this little book around the theory, which he considers very probable, that John the Baptist was an Essene. He is thus able to make full use of the classical accounts of the Essenes as well as of the Qumran scrolls in describing the setting in which the Baptist arose. In a second part of the book, S compares modern "spirituality of the desert" (e.g., de Foucauld) with the spirit of St. John. As with all the *Men of Wisdom* series, this volume is beautifully illustrated.

COMMENTARIES, EXEGESIS

R. E. DAVIES, *A Colony of Heaven, A commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (London: The Epworth Press, 1958, 5 s.), 47 pp.

This small, largely devotional commentary is substantially the text of five radio broadcast talks. Where the text is cited the RSV is used. The emphasis throughout is on the modern relevance of Paul's message to the Philippian church. A list of questions for discussion and study is appended.

J. DILLERSBERGER, *The Gospel of Saint Luke*, translated from the German (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1958, \$5.75), xiii and 558 pp.

The present work has been written in order to bring before the public a type of scriptural commentary which has rather gone out of fashion. In the first book dealing with the Annunciation (pp. 1-67), every word of the biblical text is carefully pondered. For the remaining five books the method is rather that of general commentary. In view of the audience envisaged, footnotes and bibliography are not given. The publisher states that the book was condemned by the Nazi Chamber of Literature.

The Gospel Story based on the translation of the Four Gospels by Ronald Knox arranged in a continuous narrative with explanations by Ronald Cox, C.M. (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1958, \$4.50), xiii and 437 pp.

Originally prepared as a text for gospel discussion in the New Zealand Catholic Youth Movement, *The Gospel Story* presents a chronological harmony reproducing Monsignor Knox's well-known version with a few adaptations. On one page appears the Gospel text and facing it is a page of commentary. In view of the audience footnotes and bibliography have been omitted. The volume contains a map of Palestine, four illustrations and an appendix containing a chronological harmony of all the Gospel pericopes.

T. S. KEPLER, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary for Laymen* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957, \$4.50), x and 232 pp.

Professor Thomas S. Kepler (*cf.* Biog. Notes, p. 205) has frequently lectured to ministerial conferences on the Book of Revelation and was asked by many of his listeners to write about it "in a tangible, simple idiom so that our laymen also can understand." He has done this by providing a short introduction and then commenting briefly on the RSV text. As a general principle for interpretation he has adopted the "religious-historical" method, studying the writing as related to the events of Domitian's reign in which the author wrote. Then by "demythologizing the symbols" and by "unravelling the book's religious truths" he explains its relevance for the present time.

A. R. C. LEANEY, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, Harper's New Testament Commentaries (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958, \$4.00), xii and 300 pp.

Lecturer in Christian theology at Nottingham University, the author has devoted more than ordinary attention to the theology of the third Evangelist. In the brief exegesis of the individual verses there are succinct references to the most recent literature, but the principal interest comes from the introduction in which the writer proposes and defends his own views. Thus, for example, he disagrees with A. M. Farrer, who would dispense with Q, and upholds the shorter reading of Luke's Eucharistic text with G. D. Kilpatrick.

C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J., *The Acts of the Apostles*, Stonyhurst Scripture Manuals (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1958, \$3.50), xxxvi and 199 pp.

This is the fifth volume in the Stonyhurst series for which Fr. Martindale has provided introduction and commentary. The text reproduced is the Douay version, since the series "is intended for the use of schools, especially for those who enter for public examination." In the introduction the author treats of the authorship, chronology, background and theology of the book. The notes are neither devotional nor strictly theological, but are designed to throw light on the conditions in which the infant Church began to grow.

L. MORRIS, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1958, \$3.00), 249 pp.

The Vice-Principal of Ridley College, Melbourne, has written a clear, brief commentary on the most practical of Paul's Epistles. In the introduction he exposes the problems and usually adopts traditional positions. Two interpretations of verses may be mentioned. "I [am] of Christ" (1:12) signifies a distinct group, though the exact tenets of its members cannot be clearly determined. For the *crux interpretum* (7:36) the author prefers the view that the man mentioned is the parent or guardian of a girl whose marriage he is arranging.

A. T. ROBERTSON, *Studies in Mark's Gospel*, rev. and ed. by H. F. Peacock (Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1958, \$2.50), x and 134 pp.

Almost forty years after their first appearance in book form, these essays of the late and well-known professor of NT and author of many works on the NT are again made available. The editor's work has been confined to correcting errors, popularizing the style and eliminating some obsolete references. The essays offer the preacher or lay reader conservative views on the author, date and composition of the Gospel, and on the miracles, parables and other teaching found in it.

La Sainte Bible traduite en français sous la direction de l'École Biblique de Jérusalem. *Les Épîtres de Saint Paul à Timothée et à Tite* traduites par P. Dornier, P.S.S., 2e édition revue (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1958, 240 fr.), 68 pp. *L'Épître aux Hébreux* traduite par C. Spicq, O.P., 2e édition revue (1957, 360 fr.), 96 pp.

Both of these small volumes have been revised with more emphasis placed upon the theological viewpoint, especially in the notes. For the commentary on Hebrews Père Spicq has been able to expand the former volume by eighteen pages and add references to the Qumran literature.

J. SCHNEIDER, *The Letter to the Hebrews*, trans. W. A. Mueller (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1957, \$2.50), x and 139 pp.

Dean of the Theological Faculty of the University of Berlin and the only Baptist teaching in an Evangelical-Lutheran divinity school, Professor J. Schneider sets forth simply the message of the Epistle to the Hebrews for ordinary readers, because he is convinced that the background of the letter and the problems faced by its readers resemble in many ways the situation of believers today. Because of his audience the writer dispenses with footnotes and bibliography. In an appendix he draws together the various details to present the picture of Christ given in the Epistle.

H. SCHÜRMANN, *Der Abendmahlsbericht Lucas 22, 7-38 als Gottesdienstordnung, Gemeindeordnung, Lebensordnung* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1957, DM 3.20), 108 pp.

In this small volume Professor Schürmann outlines the growth of the Lukan Eucharistic narrative and shows its meaning for the present day. In the Eucharist there are three features to be recalled and to each should be given the proper emphasis: liturgical worship, the relation to community life and the motivation for personal sanctity. Although intended for a wide audience, the book contains twelve pages of notes, and the reader is referred for further

documentation to the author's three volumes in *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen* XIX, 5; XX, 4; XX, 5.

J. STAUDINGER, S.J., *Die Bergpredigt* (Vienna: Herder, 1957, 115 Sch.; DM 19), 360 pp.

The author seeks to present the original text of the Sermon on the Mount and the explanation of its true meaning. Luke's account is based upon the preaching of the apostle James and presupposes that Matthew's text is known to his readers. The viewpoint and the treatment compared to other recent Catholic commentaries is extremely conservative.

A. STÖGER, *Oesterliche Menschen. Eine Deutung des Römerbriefes 1-8* (München: Pfeiffer, 1958), 272 pp.

The first eight chapters of the Epistle to the Romans are presented in a devotional commentary intended to express the spirit of the Catholic Easter liturgy. For this purpose the author has used scientific commentaries for his brief exegesis of each passage and then added his own reflections and quoted extensively from the writings of Saint Thérèse de Lisieux.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

R. AIGRAIN AND O. ENGLEBERT, *Prophecy Fulfilled. The Old Testament Realized in the New*, trans. L. C. Sheppard, Preface by J. M. Oesterreicher (New York: David McKay, 1958, \$3.95), xiv and 274 pp.

The authors' purpose has been to outline briefly and clearly the thread of continuity that unites the Old Testament with the New. Quotations are taken from the Douay version and from the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine translation of the OT books, where this has already appeared. The preface is written by Rev. J. M. Oesterreicher, of The Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies, Seton Hall University. At the end of the book are added an outline of the history of the Covenant, a chronological table and an index.

G. AULEN, *Eucharist and Sacrifice*, trans. E. Wahlstrom (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958, \$3.50), 207 pp.

Gustaf Aulen, author of *Christus Victor*, considers the problem of the relation between the Lord's Supper and sacrifice. After having treated the ecumenical discussions held at Edinburgh in 1937 and at Lund in 1952, and also current Anglo-Catholic and Roman Catholic views, the author considers the sacrifice motif in the thought of Luther, Irenaeus, Cyprian and St. Paul. A stresses the importance of restoring a balance in emphasis between the death and the Resurrection of Christ, between His real presence in the Eucharist and His coming again, between the forgiveness of sins and eternal life, and between the individual and communion of the saints.

O. CULLMANN, *Katholiken und Protestanten. Ein Vorschlag zur Verwirklichung christlicher Solidarität* (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1958, 2.90 Sw. fr.; DM 2.80), 67 pp.

Realizing that unity of the churches is at present impossible, Professor Cullmann proposes, as a means of expressing the practical solidarity of all Christians, that annually Catholics take up a collection for the needy among the Protestants, and Protestants for the needy among the Catholics. In his introduction and twenty-page conclusion he relates and discusses reactions to his proposal. [cf. § 475.]

J. G. DAVIES, *Members One of Another. Aspects of Koinonia* (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1958, 3 s.), 35 pp.

In this series of four lectures, Dr. Davies, Senior Lecturer in Theology in the University of Birmingham, explores the theological and ethical implications of the doctrine of *koinōnia* in the NT. He discusses successively the *koinōnia* of Christ, of the Spirit, of the Body and Blood, and of the Saints. Throughout he prefers to use the Greek word, since none of the usual renderings—fellowship, communion, contribution—covers the meaning adequately. The study is indebted chiefly to the article of D. F. Hauck in Kittel and to L. S. Thornton's *The Common Life in the Body of Christ*.

J. Jocz, *A Theology of Election. Israel and the Church*, With a Preface by the Right Reverend F. D. Coggan, D.D., Bishop of Bradford (London: S.P.C.K., 1958, 25 s.), viii and 227 pp.

Dr. Jocz, a Hebrew Christian, the author of *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ* (1949), studies the theological and spiritual aspects of the relations between the Christian Church and the Jews under the viewpoint of "election." He considers in what sense the Church is Israel and he points out the permanent significance of the Jewish people who cannot escape the marks of election. In his conclusion he states: "Israel's salvation is inseparable from that of humanity. Israel's election is the election of man. As long as there is hope for Israel there is hope for the world."

Libertas Christiana. Friedrich Delekat zum 65. Geburtstag. In Gemeinschaft mit E. Wolf besorgt von W. Matthias, Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie. Theologische Abhandlungen, herausgegeben von E. Wolf, Band 26 (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957, DM 12), 248 pp.

In his dedicatory preface Professor G. Stählin points out that the fifteen scholars who have contributed to the *Festschrift* have discussed problems which have long been the concern of Professor Delekat: Jesus Christ, the word, the Church, man in the world. For the NT the following essays are of special interest: H. Braun, "Das 'Stirb und Werde' in der Antike und im Neuen Testament"; E. Käsemann, "Aufbau und Anliegen des Johanneischen Prologs"; E. Lohse, "Imago Dei bei Paulus"; E. Schweizer, "Jesus Christus, Herr über Kirche und Welt"; E. Wolf, "Die Verlegenheit der Theologie. David Friedrich Strauss und die Bibelkritik."

K. H. SCHEKLE, *Jüngerschaft und Apostelamt. Eine biblische Auslegung des priesterlichen Dienstes* (Freiburg: Herder; New York: Herder and Herder, 1957, \$2.00), 137 pp.

On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his ordination to the Catholic priesthood, Professor Schekle has composed a series of essays on the apostolate as a token of honor to his classmates. The work is based upon the NT and takes account of important recent discussions by Catholics and Protestants.

U. SIMON, *Heaven in the Christian Tradition* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958, \$6.00), xviii and 310 pp.

The author of *Theology of Crisis*, Professor of OT at King's College, University of London, presents in this volume a biblical theology of heaven. Actually it is a rather full biblical theology which treats, in their relation to heaven,

Yahweh and Christ, the angels, Satan and the powers of evil, Christ's triumph, and the resurrection of men. In addition to both Testaments, the important apocryphal literature, the Qumran scrolls, rabbinic writings and early Christian literature and liturgy are the sources for this study.

L. A. STACHOWIAK, *Chrestotes. Ihre biblisch-theologische Entwicklung und Eigenart*. Studia Friburgensia, Neue Folge 17 (Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1957, DM 14), xix and 137 pp.

Under the direction of C. Spicq, O.P., the author has studied historically, exegetically and theologically the term *chrēstotēs* in the Bible. The word occurs frequently in both Testaments and is akin to *agapē*, and its principal function may be described as the shining forth of love. As a conclusion from his investigation S states that there is an evolution in the term which links together the beginnings of revelation with the culmination in Christ whence the idea of *chrēstotēs* regulates the entire Christian life. Fittingly does the word describe the entire economy of salvation.

T. F. TORRANCE, *When Christ Comes and Comes Again* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1957, \$3.00), 192 pp.

Dr. Thomas F. Torrance, Professor of Christian Dogmatics in the University of Edinburgh and co-editor of the *Scottish Journal of Theology*, has rewritten, in order to bring out more fully the theological content of evangelism, sixteen sermons which were originally preached in parish churches, college and school chapels and over the radio. His purpose is to provide an "evangelical tradition" which is not man-made but derived from the gospel itself. The sermons are grouped under the headings: "The Advent of the Redeemer"; "The Word of the Gospel"; "The Foundation of the Church"; "The Faithfulness of God."

H. VOLK, *Christus und Maria, Dogmatisches Grundlagen der marianischen Frömmigkeit* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2nd ed., 1958, DM 2.40), 44 pp.

In this very brief monograph, which appeared in its first edition as an article in *Catholica, Jahrbuch für Kontroverstheologie* 10 (2, '53), Dr. Hermann Volk attempts to state, not the content of Catholic belief about the Mother of God, but the theological justification of this article of faith. He distinguishes between Marian dogma and Marian piety and demonstrates the dependence of the latter on the former through the mystery of Christ Himself.

A. N. WILDER, *Theology and Modern Literature* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958, \$3.00), xii and 145 pp.

In these essays, which formed the William Belden Noble Lectures for 1956, the author, distinguished in both fields, discusses the divorce between religion and literature. After pointing out the incisive criticism which poetry and the modern novel have levelled against theology, he treats "Theology and Aesthetic Judgment" and discusses two major problems, the Crucifixion and ethical conduct, in the chapters, "The Cross: Social Trauma or Redemption" (apropos of R. Jeffers' *Dear Judas*) and "Faulkner and Vestigial Moralities." The author argues that from the continuing dialogue both theology and literature will greatly benefit.

MYTH AND HISTORY

R. BULTMANN, *Geschichte und Eschatologie* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1958, DM 12.50), viii and 188 pp. -

This German translation of the Gifford Lectures at Edinburgh, 1955, contains some modifications of views expressed in the English edition as well as many new bibliographical references. The author develops his existentialist interpretation of the meaning of history via a discussion of the efforts of other authors to solve "the problem of historicism," among them Croce, Collingwood, Dilthey, Jaspers, Butterfield and others. He accepts the solution of the first two authors mentioned, expressed in the statements: "History is the history of man," and "The relativity of every historical situation has a positive meaning." B's Christian existential view goes beyond them, however, in finding the meaning of history in the believer's responsible decisions in the eschatological present.

R. BULTMANN, *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958, \$1.95), 96 pp.

This brief statement of the author's celebrated demythologizing interpretation of the NT contains the Shaffer Lectures at Yale, 1951, and the Cole Lectures at Vanderbilt, 1951. A list of works by and about B available in English is appended to the volume. The author explains successively the nature of mythology in the NT, the beginnings of demythologizing the eschatology of the NT within the NT itself, the contemporary exigency of a demythologized message, and the nature and philosophical background of the process itself.

K. JASPERS AND R. BULTMANN, *Myth and Christianity, An inquiry into the possibility of religion without myth* (New York: Noonday Press, 1958, \$1.25 paper, \$3.00 cloth), 117 pp.

This brief volume (translated from the German *Die Frage der Entmythologisierung*, 1954) contains an essay of the *Existenz*-philosopher Jaspers on myth and religion, a reply of Bultmann on the necessity for demythologization, a further clarification by Jaspers and finally a brief note by Bultmann in the form of a letter. For Jaspers, "the language of myth is an indispensable cipher of supernatural reality, and to do away with such language would be disastrous." In these essays the two thinkers come to grips openly and strongly over the demythologizing process and its philosophical background.

J. MCINTYRE, *The Christian Doctrine of History* (Edinburgh-London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957, 12 s. 6 d.), viii and 119 pp.

Dr. McIntyre, Professor of Divinity at the University of Edinburgh, sets out from the conviction that the contemporary use of historical concepts in theology is evidence of a genuine Christian *doctrine* of history, which he expounds here. He defines history as "meaningful occurrence, and more particularly occurrence the meaning of which is a construct out of certain categories, namely, Necessity, Providence, Incarnation, Freedom and Memory." The relations of history to these categories form the principal divisions of the book. Frequent references and a short bibliography provide a survey of recent writing on the nature of history.

H. P. OWEN, *Revelation and Existence. A Study in the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1957, 15 s.), x and 160 pp.

H. P. Owen, Lecturer in the Department of Biblical Studies at the University College of North Wales, Bangor, presents in this volume a description and a

critique of the demythologizing project of Bultmann. The author is in sympathy with B's general program of giving an existential interpretation of Christian faith, but he finds that in his laudable stress of the transcendence of God B neglects the divine immanence and also exaggerates the role of "encounter" in faith. Owen finds that B has not done justice to the symbols of the NT, and he offers some positive suggestions about religious symbolism.

J. STEINBECK, *Mythus und Wahrheit im Neuen Testament. Zur Frage der Entmythologisierung des Christentums*, *Glauben und Wissen* 13 (München-Basel: Ernst Reinhardt, 1954, DM 3 paper, 4.80 cloth), 77 pp.

The author of this brief work aims at familiarizing the popular reader with the nature and necessity of the demythologizing enterprise of Bultmann. He is convinced that, kept within bounds, a demythologizing is necessary to bring out in clear light what elements of NT faith are an essential and eternal part of the message of Christ. After explaining what myth is, S applies the method to various NT themes. In view of this purpose, he avoids bringing questions of existential philosophy into the discussion.

THE WORLD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

P. BAMM, *Early Sites of Christianity*, trans. S. Godman (London: Faber and Faber, 1958, 21 s.), 240 pp. and 18 plates.

Dr. Peter Bamm, author of a popular work on World War II, narrates here in informal fashion his recent tour of the lands of the Bible and early Christianity, mingling description of ancient ruins, religious shrines and modern cities with vignettes of biblical and post-biblical history.

J. CARMIGNAC, *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres, Texte restauré, traduit, commenté, "Autour de la Bible"* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958, 2500 fr.), xx and 288 pp.

This exhaustive work on the War Scroll is the first of two volumes projected; it contains text, translation and commentary. In anticipation of the philological, historical and theological study of the document to appear in the second volume, the author treats these aspects very briefly here in an introduction. The commentary was completed in early 1956; literature on the War Scroll appearing in 1956-57 is discussed in a brief supplement. In the reconstruction and commentary cognizance is taken of the Cave 4 fragments of the War document.

H. E. DEL MEDICO, *Le Mythe des Esséniens, des origines à la fin du moyen âge* (Paris: Plon, 1958, 1500 fr.), 334 pp. and 3 folding charts.

As the title implies, the thesis of this work is that there never existed a sect known as the Essenes nor was there ever any Jewish monasticism. The author of the recent *L'énigme des manuscrits de la mer Morte* (Paris, 1957) here offers a detailed study of the texts of Philo, Pliny, Josephus and their interpreters on the Essenes. The Dead Sea Scrolls are left out of account, since M. Del Medico finds no trace of Essenism in them; he treats of the problem raised by the archaeology of Qumran, however, in an appendix.

H. JONAS, *The Gnostic Religion. The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958, \$6.00), xviii and 302 pp.

The author, currently professor at the New School for Social Research, New York City, is an acknowledged authority on Gnosticism. The present work

is an original one, not a translation of J's *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*. Addressed to the general reader, this volume aims at presenting Gnosticism as a philosophico-religious system. Special attention is devoted to explaining imagery and symbolism and to outlining, sometimes with texts and extended commentary, the various systems called Gnostic. The most recent texts and studies are used and a general bibliography is provided.

G. MOLIN, *Lob Gottes aus der Wüste. Lieder und Gebete aus den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (Freiburg-München: Karl Alber, 1957, DM 6.20), 68 pp.

The author of *Die Söhne des Lichtes*, who is Lecturer in West Semitic Languages at the University of Graz, presents here a translation of selected hymns from the Qumran *Hodayot*, the Manual of Discipline, the War Scroll and certain fragments. In an introduction to the selections, he provides the general reader with a brief account of the scrolls used and of the theology and spirituality of the hymns. The translator regards the selections less as hymns in the formal sense than as meditative prayers.

G. E. WRIGHT AND F. V. FILSON, eds., *Westminster Historical Maps of Bible Lands* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1952, \$1.00), 16 plates.

This pamphlet provides teachers and students with the familiar maps of the *Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible* in a convenient format (approximately 5 by 8 inches). An index accompanies the maps.

ADDITIONAL BOOKS RECEIVED

The Bridge: A Yearbook of Judaeo-Christian Studies, ed. J. M. Oesterreicher, vol. III (New York: Pantheon Books, 1958, \$4.50), 383 pp.

A Catholic Catechism (New York: Herder and Herder, 1958, \$2.00), xvi and 448 pp. A second impression of the popular edition.

F. CUTTAZ, *Our Life of Grace*, trans. Angeline Bouchard (Chicago: Fides Publishers, 1958, \$6.95), viii and 327 pp. C's purpose is to show the positive meaning of grace, the moral and mystical consequences of the effects of grace. The book has three parts: The Formal Effects of Grace; The Effects of Grace Distinct from It; The Effects of Grace That Stem from Our Prayers and Good Works.

H. DANIEL-ROPS, *What is the Bible?*, trans. J. R. Foster, The Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism, vol. 60 (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1958, \$2.95), 128 pp. This first volume to be published in the English translation of the *Encyclopédie du Catholique au XX^e Siècle* is a popular general introduction to the text, canon, inspiration, history and theology of the Bible.

E. DERMENGHEM, *Muhammad and the Islamic Tradition*, trans. J. M. Watt, Men of Wisdom Books 6 (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958, \$1.50), 191 pp., 92 illustrations. A copiously illustrated life of the Prophet, description of Islamic tradition and selection of texts.

P. EVDOKIMOV, *La femme et le salut du monde. Étude d'Anthropologie chrétienne sur les charismes de la femme* (Tournai-Paris: Casterman, 1958, 87 Bel. fr.), 273 pp., 3 plates.

J. M. KIK, *Revelation Twenty. An Exposition* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1955, \$2.00), x and 92 pp.

K. S. LATOURETTE, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age. A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, vol. I: *The Nineteenth Century in Europe. Background and the Roman Catholic Phase* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958, \$6.00), xiv and 498 pp. This is the first in a projected five-volume series.

La Sainte Bible traduite en français sous la direction de l'École Biblique de Jérusalem (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957-58). This is the second, completely revised edition of the Jerusalem Bible in fascicles; the following OT volumes have appeared to date, each with introduction, translation and notes:

L'Exode, B. Couroyer, O.P. (1958, 600 fr.), 182 pp., map.

Le Lévitique, H. Cazelles, P.S.S. (1958, 420 fr.), 131 pp.

Le Deutéronome, H. Cazelles, P.S.S. (1958, 465 fr.), 143 pp., map.

Le Livre des Juges, le Livre de Ruth, A. Vincent (1958, 540 fr.), 164 pp., map.

Les Livres des Rois, R. de Vaux, O.P. (1958, 690 fr.), 248 pp., map.

Tobie, R. Pautrel, S.J. (1957, 270 fr.), 63 pp.

Le Livre de Job, C. Larcher, O.P. (1957, 555 fr.), 171 pp.

Le Livre des Proverbes, H. Duesberg, O.S.B., and P. Auvray (1957, 465 fr.), 133 pp.

L'Ecclésiaste, R. Pautrel, S.J. (1958, 255 fr.), 43 pp.

Le Livre de la Sagesse, E. Osty, P.S.S. (1957, 420 fr.), 115 pp.

L'Ecclésiastique, H. Duesberg, O.S.B., and P. Auvray (1958, 780 fr.), 237 pp.

Isaïe, P. Auvray and J. Steinmann (1957, 825 fr.), 265 pp.

Ézéchiel, P. Auvray (1957, 660 fr.), 195 pp.

Daniel, J. de Menasce, O.P. (1958, 390 fr.), 106 pp.

Le Livre de Jonas, A. Feuillet, P.S.S. (1957, 150 fr.), 35 pp.

Michée, Sophonie, Nahum, A. George, S.M. (1958, 360 fr.), 97 pp.

L. SOUBIGOU, *Méditons et prêchons les Épîtres de Saint-Paul* (Paris: Lethiel-leux, 1958, 1200 fr.), 300 pp. A completely revised edition of *Les Épîtres de l'Année liturgique étudiées en vue de la Prédication* (1934).

Supplément de la Vie Spirituelle (45 bis, 1958): Tables décennales, 1947-1957, nos. 1 à 43 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1958, 150 fr.), 76 pp. Systematic and alphabetical indexes for ten years of the *Supplément*.

